

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

VOLUME LVII

1942

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1942

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LVII

	PAGE
Salinger, Herman, Rilke's Opening Lines....	1
Peters, H. F., Rilke—Rodin: A Correction ..	9
Magoun, F. P., Jr., Norman History in the "Lay of the Beach" (<i>Strandar ljóð</i>) ..	11
Robbins, R. H., The Burden in Carols....	16
Dilts, Dorothy A., John Gower and the <i>De Genealogia Deorum</i> ...	23
Dilts, Dorothy A., Observations on Dante and the <i>House of Fame</i> .	26
Stearns, M. W., Chaucer Mentions a Book.	28
Duncan, E. H., Chaucer and "Arnold of the Newe Toun"....	31
Blenner-Hassett, R., "When he His 'Papir' Soghte," CT A-4404 ..	34
Fucilla, J. G., Sannazaro's <i>Arcadia</i> and Gálvez de Montalvo's <i>El Pastor de Filida</i> ...	35
Kahane, Renée T., Some Sandhi Phenomena in Modern Greek ...	39
Kocher, P. H., Some Nashe Marginalia Concerning Marlowe	45
Jackson, J. L., The Exchange of Weapons in <i>Hamlet</i> ...	50
Avery, E. L., The Première of <i>The Mourning Bride</i>	55
Mathews, E. G., Cokain's <i>The Obstinate Lady</i> and the <i>Araucana</i> .	57
Kurrelmeyer, W., Kaulbach's Illustrated Edition of Goethe's <i>Reineke Fuchs</i> , 1846.....	59
Schirokauer, Arno, Der Eingang des Lorsche Bienensegens.....	62
Yohannan, J. D., Tennyson and Persian Poetry.....	83
Roberts, R. P. ap, Notes on <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i> , iv, 1397-1414...	92
Kokeritz, Helge, Elizabethan <i>che vore ye 'I warrant you'</i> .	98
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Chez Vandamme sont venus</i>	103
Allen, N. B., A Note on Coleridge's "Kubla Khan,".....	108
Cronin, Grover, Jr., John Mirk on Bonfires, Elephants and Dragons..	113
Robertson, Jean, Nicholas Breton's <i>The Hate of Treason</i> .	116
Waith, E. M., The Ascription of Speeches in <i>The Revenger's Tragedy</i> .	119
Reil, H. J., Jr., Goldsmith and the Pickle-Shop.....	121
Duffy, Charles, "The Wolf's Long Howl"	123
Malone, Kemp, Some Linguistic Studies of 1939 and 1940.....	123
Kurrelmeyer, W., German Lexicography. Part VIII.	163
Dempster, Germaine, "Thy Gentillesse" in <i>Wife of Bath's Tale</i> , D 1159-62	173
Frost, George L., "That Precious Corpus Madrian".....	177
Blenner-Hassett, Roland, <i>Gernemuße</i> : a Place-Name Puzzle in Law- man's <i>Brut</i>	179
Manning, C. A., Alyosha Valkovsky and Prince Myshkin.....	182
Quynn, D. M. and Snellgrove, H. S., Slandorous Comedies at the University of Orleans in 1447.....	185
Holmes, U. T., Jr., <i>Ludos scenicus</i> in Giraldus.....	188
Cioranescu, Alexandre, Pour l'histoire du <i>Roman Royal</i>	190

	PAGE
Evans, G. Blakemore, Two New Manuscript Versions of Milton's Hobson Poems	192
Simmons, J., An Unpublished Letter from Abraham Cowley	194
Berend, Eduard, Les Beaux Esprits se rencontrent	195
Healy, D. M., A Note on Mérimée's Correspondence	198
Niess, R. J., Zola's <i>la Joie de vivre</i> and <i>la Mort d'Olivier Bécaille</i> . .	205
Jones, M. B., <i>L'Attaque du moulin</i> in American Translation	207
Vail Motter, T. H., When Did Tennyson Meet Hallam?	209
Beall, C. B., Housman, Dehmal and Dante	211
Zdanowicz, Casimir D., Jean Crosnier	245
Spitzer, Leo, Anc. Fr. <i>Agopart</i> 'Ethiopien'	252
Hutton, James, Germain Colin Bucher and Girolamo Angeriano	260
Schirokauer, Arno, Öwer Kopp un Wunnen	264
Baldensperger, Fernand, <i>La Première Relation intellectuelle de David</i> Hume en France: une conjecture	268
Sewall, R. B., An Early Manuscript Translation of Rousseau's Second <i>Discours</i>	271
Adams, Percy G., Poe, Critic of Voltaire	273
Craig, H. S., Jr., An Unpublished Letter of Ernest Renan	275
Furst, Norbert, Kleist's "Erfindung"	278
Whitbread, L., Beowulf and Grendel's Mother, Two Minor Parallels from Folklore	281
Hagge, C. W., G. H. Calvert's Translations from the German	282
Beall, C. B., Kenelm Digby's "Thuscan Virgil"	284
Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., Foote and a Friend of Boswell's: a Note on <i>The Nabob</i>	325
Ghiselin, Brewster, Paeonic Measures in English Verse	336
Wright, H. Bunker, Matthew Prior's Funeral	341
Bacon, W. A., The Source of Robert Daborne's <i>The Poor-Mans Comfort</i> Oake, R. B., Political Elements in Criticism of Voltaire in England 1732-47	348
Pike, R. E., Voltaire: <i>Le Patriot Insulaire</i>	354
Frank, Grace, Voltaire to Mazzuchelli	355
Spitzer, Leo, Fr. <i>mitant</i> 'the Middle,' 'the Half,'	356
Fellheimer, Jeannette, Barnabe Barnes' Use of Geoffrey Fenton's <i>Historie of Guicciardin</i>	358
Botting, R. B., Gray and Christopher Smart	360
Boys, R. C., A New Poem by Mrs. Centlivre	361
Rubin, J. J., Carlyle on Contemporary Style	362
Gilbert, A. H., A Poem Wrongly Attributed to Sidney	364
Scherer, Jacques, Sur le sons des titres de quelques comédies de Molière	407
Hatcher, Anna G., The use of <i>a</i> as a Designation of the Personal Accusative in Spanish	421
Beall, C. B., Un écho de Guinicelli dans Philippe Desportes	429
Mezger, Fritz, The Formation of Old High German <i>diorna</i> , Old Saxon <i>thiorna</i> , Gothic <i>widuwarna</i> and Old English <i>nhwerne</i>	432
Hull, Vernam, The Quarrel between Finn and Oisín	434

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Pyles, Thomas, "Dan Chaucer"	437
Lynch, J. J., The Prioress's Gems	440
Correll, R. M., John Payne Collier and <i>The Murder of John Brewen</i>	441
Kallich, Martin, Unity of Time in <i>Every Man in his Humor</i> and <i>Cynthia's Revels</i>	445
McManaway, J. C., The License for Shakespeare's Marriage.	450
Emery, Clark, A Further Note on Drehbel's Submarine	451
Law, R. A., "Muck-Rakers" before Bunyan	455
Furst, Norbert, Kleist's "Unsichtbares Theater".	457
Wardle, R. M., Outwitting Hazlitt	459
Wells, Minnie E., "The Eve of St. Agnes" and "The Legend of Britomartis"	463
Wiener, H. S. L., A Correction in Byron Scholarship.	465
Ewing, Majl, The Authorship of Some Nineteenth-Century Plays	466

LANCASTER TESTIMONIAL NUMBER "

Alonso, Amado, The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts.	489
Armstrong, Edward C., Old-French <i>Le chief d'une montagne</i>	496
Baldensperger, Fernand, Goethe Historien littéraire.	500
Castro, Américo, La palabra <i>títore</i>	505
Chinard, Gilbert, Notes sur une Pensée de Pascal	510
Cohen, Gustave, Un Recueil de Farces inédites du XV ^e siècle.	520
†Cons, Louis, Five Notes on the Text of Villon	526
Frank, Grace, The Distant Love of Jaufré Rudel	528
Lewent, Kurt, Father and Son in Provençal Poetry.	534
Morley, S. Griswold, "Pozos de nieve"	541
Muller, Henri F., The Beginnings of French Fixed Word Order.	546
Nitze, William A., Pascal and the Medieval Definition of God.	552
Peyre, Henri, André Gide et les Problèmes d'influence en littérature.	558
Salinas, Pedro, La espada y los tiempos de la vida en <i>Las mocedades del Cid</i>	568
Schinz, Albert, Les Dangers du Cliché littéraire: Le Dr Johnson et Jean-Jacques Rousseau.	573
Shaw, J. E., "Per l'altre" <i>Convivio</i> , III, xiv, 15	580
Singleton, Charles S., Machiavelli and the Spirit of Comedy.	585
Smith, Horatio, Sainte-Beuve on Science and Human Nature. Jouffroy, Le Play, Proudhon.	592
Spitzer, Leo, Eng. <i>dismal</i> = O. F. * <i>dism-al</i>	602

Jackson, J. L., The Fencing Actor-Lines in Shakespeare's Plays	615
Dolk, Lester, The Reception of <i>Modern Painters</i>	621
Williams, Ralph M., Two Unpublished Poems by Mark Akenside.	626
Livingston, C. H., Etymologies of Old French <i>racchier</i> and English <i>rack</i>	631
Echols, John M., An Old Saxon Ghost-Word.	639

	PAGE.
Fay, Eliot G., Rubén Dario in New York	641
Rabinovitz, A. L., Hugo's <i>Bancroft</i> and <i>Le Message de Grant</i>	648
Whallon, A. J., Jr., An Unpublished Letter from Jean-Baptiste Rousseau to d'Argental	652
Hamilton, Marie P., The Summonet's "Psalm of Davit"	655
Hutton, James, Spenser and the "Cinq Points en Amours"	657
Cooper, Harold, John Donne and Virginia in 1610	661
Eliason, N. E., Shakespeare's Purgative Drug <i>cyme</i>	663
Morris, R. L., Addison's <i>miut wit</i>	666
Pettit, Henry, The Text of Edward Young's Letters to Samuel Richardson	668
Heilman, R. B., Fielding and "the First Gothic Revival"	671
Cameron, K. L., Shelley and the <i>Conciones ad Populum</i>	673
Howard, E. J., Four Words in Coxe's <i>A Short Treatise . . of Magicall Sciences</i>	674
Starr, H. W., Gray's Opinion of Parnell	675
Starr, H. W., A Echo of <i>L'Allegro</i> in Gray's <i>Bard</i>	676

REVIEWS

A. G. Brodeur, Arthur, Dux Bellorum. [W. A. Nitze.]	64
Duncan Mallam (ed.), Letters of William Shenstone; Marjorie Wil- liams (ed.), The Letters of William Shenstone. [Robert Shafer.]	68
William Nelson, John Skelton, Laureate. [Ray Heffner.]	72
F. J. Schmitz, Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus [George Stefansky.]	74
Bronson, Caldwell, Cline, McKenzie, Ross, Five Studies in Literature [M. W. Croll.]	76
Mario Pei, The Italian Language. [Leo Spitzer.]	148
Albert Feuillerat (ed.), Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University. [H. C. Lancaster.]	151
MARGARET WILLIAMS (tr. and ed.), Word Hoard. Passages from Old English Literature from the Sixth to the Eleventh Centuries. [Kemp Malone.]	156
G. N. Shuster, The English Ode from Milton to Keats. [Robert Shafer.]	158
Herbert Davis, W. C. de Vane, and R. C. Bald (eds.), Nineteenth- Century Studies. [Alice D. Snyder.]	159
F. O. Matthiessen, American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman; Stanley Williams (ed.), <i>Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle</i> . By Washington Irving; Richard Webb and E. R. Coulson, Sidney Lanier: Poet and Prosodist; J. W. Beach, American Fiction, 1920-1940. [O. R. Anderson.]	212
E. K. Heningham (ed.), An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum. [George Sanderlin.]	217
H. E. Woodbridge, Sir William Temple, The Man and His Work; F. J. Fielden (ed.), Sir William Temple: Three Essays. [C. M. Kirk.]	219

CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
N. I. White, Shelley [<i>Elizabeth Nitchie</i> .].....	221
G. I. Duthie, The 'Bad' Quarto of <i>Hamlet</i> : a Critical Study. [<i>Hazelton Spencer</i>] ...	223
J. C. Hodges, William Congreve the Man, a Biography from New * Sources. [<i>Hazelton Spencer</i> .]	226
C. W. Mendell, Our Seneca. [<i>R. M. Haywood</i> .].. ..	228
T. H. Johnson, The Printed Writings of Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, a Bibliography. [<i>O. E. Winslow</i> .]	230
Correspondence of Robert Bridges and Henry Bradley, 1900-1923. [<i>Robert Hillyer</i>]	232
J. A. Gee and P. J. Sturm (trans. and eds.), Letters of Joseph Conrad to Marguerite Poradowska 1890-1920. [<i>J. D. Gordan</i> .].....	233
Al. Cioranescu, L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII ^e siècle. [<i>C. B. Beall</i> .].. ..	234
Harry Rudman, Italian Nationalism and English Letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian Men of Letters. [<i>K. R. Green- field</i> .]	235
R. K. Bowman, The Connections of the <i>Geste des Loherains</i> with Other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres. [<i>Bateman Edwards</i> .].....	236
I. O. Wade, Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet: an Essay on the Intel- lectual Activity at Cirey. [<i>Emile Malakis</i> .].....	238
A. Schirokauer and W. Paulsen (eds.), Corona. Studies in Philology in Celebration of the Eightieth Birthday of Samuel Singer. [<i>A. E. Zucker</i> .].....	239
F. W. Bateson (ed.), The Cambridge Bibliography of English Litera- ture. [<i>L. N. Broughton</i> .].....	285
A. R. Hohlfield, Martin Joos, W. F. Twaddell, Wortindex zu Goethes <i>Faust</i> . [<i>J. A. Walz</i> .].....	288
H. C. Combs and Z. R. Sullens, A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne. [<i>Lane Cooper</i> .].....	291
C. K. Hyder, A Concordance to the Poems of A. E. Housman; T. G. Ehrsam, A Bibliography of Alfred Edward Housman. [<i>William White</i> .]	293
Grant McColley, <i>Paradise Lost</i> : An Account of Its Growth and Major Origins, with a Discussion of Milton's Use of Sources and Literary Patterns. [<i>Maurice Kelley and T. S. K. Scott-Craig</i> .].....	295
W. J. Norton, Jr., Bishop Butler, Moralist and Divine. [<i>E. C. Mossner</i> .]	297
Rose Mary Davis, The Good Lord Lyttelton: A Study in Eighteenth Century Politics and Culture. [<i>A. S. P. Woodhouse</i> .].....	298
W. H. Irving, John Gay, Favorite of the Wits. [<i>C. K. Eves</i> .].....	300
Ernest Earnest, John and William Bartram, Botanists and Explorers; 1699-1777, 1739-1823. [<i>Lane Cooper</i> .].....	301
Brice Harris, Charles Sackville, sixth Earl of Dorset, patron and poet of the Restoration. [<i>A. H. Nethercot</i> .].....	302
F. E. Ratchford, The Brontës' Web of Childhood; C. W. Hatfield (ed.), The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë. [<i>Leicester Bradner</i> .]	304

	PAGE
H. R. Brown, <i>The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860.</i> [<i>Lois Whitney.</i>]	305
J. D. Gordan, Joseph Conrad, <i>The Making of a Novelist.</i> [<i>G. T. Keating</i>]	307
E. W. Parks, Charles Egbert Craddock (Noailles Mufree). [<i>P. B. Mullett.</i>]	308
P. J. Brockway, Sylvester Judd (1813-1853), <i>Novelist of Transcendentalism.</i> [<i>S. T. Williams</i>]	309
Glenn Gray, <i>Hegel's Hellenic Ideal.</i> [<i>George Steffansky.</i>]	310
E. L. Griggs, <i>Coleridge Fille, A Biography of Sara Coleridge.</i> [<i>R. C. Bald.</i>]	311
D. Wellesley (ed.), <i>Letters on Poetry from W. B. Yeats to Dorothy Wellesley.</i> [<i>Cleanth Brooks.</i>]	312
L. B. Simpson (ed.), <i>El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho de Alfonso Martínez de Toledo</i> [<i>M. I. Smith</i>]	313
J. J. Parry (ed.), <i>The Art of Courtly Love</i> by Andreas Capellanus. [<i>Sidney Painter.</i>]	315
R. T. Hill and T. G. Bergin (eds.), <i>Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours.</i> [<i>A. H. Schutz.</i>]	316
H. G. Harvey, <i>The Theatre of the Basoche. The Contribution of the Law Societies to French Mediaeval Comedy.</i> [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	317
Séraphin Marion, <i>Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois.</i> [<i>N. B. Ham.</i>]	318
B. Roland Lewis (ed.), <i>The Shakespeare Documents, Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations and Commentary.</i> [<i>T. W. Baldwin.</i>]	364
M. A. Shaaber (ed.), <i>The Second Part of Henry the Fourth. The New Variorum Shakespeare.</i> [<i>Madeleine Doran.</i>]	373
Alwin Thaler, <i>Shakespeare and Democracy.</i> [<i>Alfred Harbage.</i>]	376
H. E. Rollins (ed.), <i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i> by William Shakespeare. The Third Edition, 1612. [<i>T. Brooke.</i>]	378
F. W. Noss, <i>The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Play.</i> [<i>J. W. Draper.</i>]	379
R. W. Chambers, <i>Man's Unconquerable Mind. Studies of English Writers, from Bede to A. H. Housman and W. P. Ker.</i> [<i>W. F. Bryan.</i>]	381
W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster (eds.), <i>Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.</i> [<i>H. R. Patch.</i>]	383
John Butt and Geoffrey Tillotson (eds.), <i>The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope, Volumes IV and II.</i> [<i>George Sherburn.</i>]	385
D. A. Stauffer, <i>The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England; A. K. Tuel, John Sterling: A Representative Victorian.</i> [<i>W. H. Dunn.</i>]	386
Kurt Weber, <i>Lucius Cary, Second Viscount Falkland.</i> [<i>P. B. Bartlett.</i>]	389
J. L. Clifford, <i>Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale).</i> [<i>E. L. Greene.</i>]	390
A. H. King, <i>The Language of Satirized Characters in Pottaster.</i> [<i>N. E. Eliason.</i>]	392
Otto Jespersen, <i>The 'Split Infinitive' and A System of Clauses; W. A. Craigie, The Growth of American English.</i> [<i>N. E. Eliason.</i>]	394

CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
E. H. Criswell, Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers. [N. E. Eliason.]	396
J. E. Barker, Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the <i>Encyclopédie</i> . [G. R. Havens.]	398
R. A. Hall, Jr., Bibliography of Italian Linguistics. [L. F. Solano.]	400
Pedro Salinas, <i>Truth of Two</i> and Other Poems. Translations of Eleanor L. Turnbull. [C. Castillo]	401
Arlin Turner (ed.), Hawthorne as Editor. [G. H. Orians.]	402
W. R. Parker, Milton's Contemporary Reputation [J. S. Dieckhoff.]	403
R. A. Gettmann, Turgenev in England and America. [H. Muchnic]	404
P. V. Kreider, Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays; J. E. Hankins, The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays; The Life and Works of George Turberville; Clare Howard (ed.), The Poems of Sir John Davies; C. M. Coffin (ed.), <i>Ignatius His Conclave</i> , by John Donne; Sister M. B. Mroz, Divine Vengeance: A Study in the Philosophical Backgrounds of the Revenge Motif as It Appears in Shakespeare's Chronicle History Plays; A. F. Herr, The Elizabethan Sermon, A Survey and a Bibliography; E. H. Sloane, Robert Gould, Seventeenth Century Satirist. [Fredson Bowers.]	468
Raymond D. Havens, The Mind of a Poet: A Study of Wordsworth's Thought with Particular Reference to "The Prelude." [J. W. Beach.]	473
L. Clark Keating, Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615. [E. F. Meylan.]	476
A. H. Gilbert (ed. and trans.), Machiavelli, <i>The Prince</i> and Other Works Including <i>Reform in Florence</i> , <i>Castruccio Castracani</i> , <i>On Fortune</i> , Letters, Ten Discourses on Livy. [F. C. Lane.]	478
H. M. Belden (ed.), Ballads and Songs Collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society. [J. W. Spargo.]	479
L. A. Marchand, <i>The Athenacum</i> : a Mirror of Victorian Culture; Ralf Buchmann, Martin F. Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind; M. M. Bevington, <i>The Saturday Review</i> , 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England. [M. M. H. Thrall.]	677
Walter Graham (ed.), The Letters of Joseph Addison. [Rae Blanchard.]	679
Leonora Cohen Rosenfield, From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to La Mettrie. [G. R. Havens.]	681
P. P. Rogers, Goldoni in Spain. [John Van Horne.]	683
Yvonne Bézard (ed.), Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève. [Herbert Dieckmann.]	684

BRIEF MENTION

Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien. [Archer Taylor.]	77
C. F. Mullett (ed.), The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntington. [H. N. Fairchild.]	78
Lord David Cecil (ed.), The Oxford Book of Christian Verse. [H. N. Fairchild.]	78

	PAGE
Axel Olrik (ed.), E. M. Smith-Dampier (trans.), <i>A Book of Danish Ballads</i> . [<i>Kemp Malone</i> .]	79
C. M. Garnier, Elixé, <i>Histoire d'Irlande</i> . [<i>Kemp Malone</i> .]	79
S. K. Workman, <i>Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose</i> . [<i>Kemp Malone</i>]	79
Ernst Beutler (ed.), <i>Goethes Rede zum Shakespears Tag</i> . [<i>Ernst Feise</i> .]	80
R. H. Thomas, <i>The Classical Ideal in German Literature. An Introduction and an Anthology</i> . [<i>Ernst Feise</i> .]	80
Albert Feuillerat, <i>Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or</i> . [<i>H. C. Lancaster</i> .]	81
Irene Wiem, <i>Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600</i> . [<i>L. M. Price</i> .]	161
Willem de Vrcese and Jan de Vries (eds.), <i>Das Dyalogus of twisprake tusschen den wisen coninck Salomon ende Marcolphus</i> . [<i>Archer Taylor</i> .]	162
Leah Jonas, <i>The Divine Science: the Aesthetic of Some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets</i> . [<i>R. Florence Brinkley</i> .]	241
Martha H. Shackford (ed.), <i>Letters from Elizabeth Barrett to B. R. Haydon</i> . [<i>W. O. De Vane</i> .]	242
<i>Fifty Years of German Drama</i> . [<i>H. Steinhauer</i> .]	242
Dorothy M. Hoare, <i>Some Studies in the Modern Novel</i> . [<i>Louis Tector</i> .]	243
T. O. Mabbott (ed.), <i>Tamcrane and Other Poems</i> . By a Bostonian. [<i>J. C. French</i> .]	244
Elisabeth Haller, <i>Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen, und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnet's "Theory of the Earth"</i> . [<i>Morris W. Croll</i> .]	320
Mary Thorp, <i>The Study of the Nibelungenlied, Being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937</i> . [<i>Carl Selmer</i> .]	321
G. E. Bentley, <i>The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players</i> . [<i>Hazelton Spencer</i> .]	321
Emery Neff, <i>A Revolution in European Poetry</i> . [<i>O. P. Lyons</i> .]	322
Leo J. Henkin, <i>Darwinism in the English Novel, 1860-1910</i> . [<i>G. R. Potter</i> .]	323
A. B. Sutherland, Maurice Hewlett: <i>Historical Romancer</i> . [<i>J. T. Hillhouse</i> .]	324
F. A. Patterson and F. R. Fogle, <i>An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton</i> . [<i>W. R. Parker</i> .]	405
J. K. Bostock (ed.), <i>Der arme Heinrich, a Poem by Hartmann von Ouwe</i> . [<i>Carl Selmer</i> .]	406
W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., <i>The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson</i> . [<i>Morris W. Croll</i> .]	481
R. C. Boys (ed.), <i>Grongar Hill</i> . By John Dyer. [<i>A. D. McKillop</i> .]	481
H. F. Fletcher (ed.), <i>The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton</i> . [<i>W. R. Parker</i> .]	686

CONTENTS

xi

PAGE

G. Fucilla, Universal Author Repertoire of Italian Essay Literature. [<i>C. S. Singleton.</i>]	686
D. Altick, Richard Owen Cambridge. Belated Augustan. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>]	687

CORRESPONDENCE

Norman L. Torrey, Montaigne and Democracy	81
Marcel Françon, La Démocratie de Montaigne	82
Albert Feuillerat, Renan et Luzel	482
A. R. Hohlfeld, Wortindex zu Goethes <i>Faust</i>	483
Edward C. Armstrong, Yet Again the Açoparts	485
Leo Spitzer, Reply	486
Tucker Brooke, The License for Shakespeare's Marriage	687
J. G. McManaway, Reply	688
G. Levi Della Vida, Encore Anc. Fr. Açopart 'Ethiopien'	690
Henri Grégoire, Encore et toujours les Açoparts (ou de l'utilité du grec byzantin pour les études romanes)	691
G. Levi Della Vida, Réponse	694

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

JANUARY, 1942

Number 1

RILKE'S OPENING LINES

The choice of a poet's opening lines as an object of special study and scholarly interest is not at once self-explanatory or self-justifying. Two questions probably assert themselves promptly to the reader's mind: Can the opening line be treated apart from the stanza, from the poem as a whole, as an entity in itself? To which the answer is conditional. The second question concerns poets in general, Rilke in particular. Are we, by virtue of our present approach, suggesting its validity for all poets, or is it, for some reason, especially worth-while where Rilke is concerned? It is not here intended to endow the first line with an especial importance extending to all poets, nor would it be easy to generalize in the other direction, namely restrictively, excluding certain poets or certain literary periods.

It might prove true, on investigation, that the first lines of, let us say, Goethe, Heine, and Dehmel have certain distinctive qualities and a personality of their own, even that they are occasionally of real importance within their setting, and might, like any other poetic line, be taken as hallmarks of the poet, his style or his time. Such deliberations are, however, extrinsic.

Our consideration of Rilke's opening lines grew out of those lines themselves and what seems to be their deeply intrinsic significance to his art. For whatever the opening line accomplishes in the work of the other poets mentioned, it is doubtful whether it is as highly functional there as in the work of Rilke.

This fact becomes evident as soon as we examine the first lines. To an astonishing degree they evoke the totality of their poems and their poet. How symptomatic of its part of the *Stundenbuch*, for instance, is the line: "Ich liebe meines Wesens Dunkelstunden"¹

¹ *Das Stunden-Buch, I. Buch, Das Buch vom mönchischen Leben (1899); Ges. Werke* II, 176. (Not publ. until 1905).

and how significant of Rilke's monumental acceptance of self. Or again: "Ich lebe mein Leben in wachsenden Ringen,"² or "Ich glaube an alles noch nie Gesagte."³ Other initial lines bring out the tremendous stature of the Divinity he is addressing and the balances and contrasts inherent in the *Nebeneinander* of God and his poet: "Du, Nachbar Gott, wenn ich dich manches Mal"⁴—"Du Dunkelheit, aus der ich stamme,"⁵—"Du stehst, ich will viel."⁶—"Du bist so gross, dass ich schon nicht mehr bin, . . ."⁷ Around one such first line: "Ich bin, du Ängstlicher. Hörst du mich nicht" other lines crystallize; the ancient dichotomy of every poet's universe into *ich* and *du* is necessary before a confluence—not merely of two lovers, but of the universe and the individual—can be brought about a moment later:

Wenn du der Traumer bist, bin ich dein Traum.
Doch wenn du wachen willst, bin ich dein Wille . . .

Again, in one initial line, man's dependence on the Deity is so thoroughly reexperienced, undergoes such a creative reorganization that a single cry: "Was wirst du tun, Gott, wenn ich sterbe?"⁸ contains an entire poem, so that the remainder is a mere résumé in the form of enumeration and variation:

Ich bin dein Krug (wenn ich zerscherbe?)
Ich bin dein Trank (wenn ich verderbe?)
Bin dein Gewand und dein Gewerbe, . . .

and at the end, the first notes are still echoing: "Was wirst du tun, Gott? Ich bin bange."

The opening line, then, is apparently not an entity *per se*, in so far as it is discovered as one end of a bridge reaching to the last line. In fact, being organic and functional within the whole, critical interference is required to sever it and set it apart. Moreover, in Rilke a striving toward continuousness asserts itself early and remains an essential even in the late days at Muzot when, through solitude, he is hoping to reestablish what he calls "etwas von der Kontinuität meiner innerlichen Arbeit und Besinnung."¹⁰ This continuity should be present, as within the larger nature of the poet,

² *Ibid.*, 175.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 177.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 186.

³ *Ibid.*, 181.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 180.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 198.

¹⁰ Letter to Ilse Blumenthal-Weiss, 29. Dec. 1921; *Briefe aus Muzot*, p. 70 f.

so also in the smaller unit of his work. A distinction needs to be made: we are not aiming at establishing the first line as an independent existence, but merely as a working unit. Though not an entity *per se*, it can profitably and needs momentarily to be treated as such.

We experience the effect of one opening line after another unfolding. Can we measure these effects by shopworn rulers and rusted aesthetic scales? That is to risk losing the spirit, especially if we aim directly at a thorough-going classification. Yet if the opening line is anything more than merely the first in a series of poetic moments, if indeed it is the revealing symptom of an underlying urge, then certain means must lie at hand, by which we can determine its morphology and analyze its function.

One such means to suggest itself is Rilke's choice of words, specifically of grammatical forms: for instance, the frequent interrogative beginning. The abrupt "Was gibts?"¹¹ intentionally produces the effect of crudeness; the rhetorical questions to God in the *Stundenbuch* ("Was wirst du tun, Gott . . . ?" and others¹²) express an anxiety or even a dissatisfaction. Or the beginning question runs obligato-like through the first half of the poem *Musik*: "Was spielst du, Knabe?"¹³ The *Liebeslied* in *Neue Gedichte* opens with the first of four questions. The final image of the lovers, played upon like an instrument in the hand of some unseen player, is already prepared and their attitude of helplessness set in the opening question:¹⁴

Wie soll ich meine Seele halten, dass
sie nicht an deine rührt? . . .

Syntactically among the most striking types of beginning is the use of "Und . . ." to start many poems, no fewer, in fact, than three dozen, so that this type approaches almost to the point of mannerism. Its functional motivation, however, saves Rilke from such a charge, for example in *Fortschritt (Buch der Bilder)*.¹⁵ The

¹¹ *Ges. Werke*, I, 82. (*Erste Gedichte, Larenopfer, 1896. "Aus dem Dreissigjährigen Kriege / Kohlenskizzen in Callots Manier, 5.)*

¹² II, 198 (s. above) and, e. g., II, 185: "Was irren meine Hände in den Pinseln?"

¹³ II, 22. *Buch der Bilder, I. Buch, I. Teil.* (Finished 1901, first edition published 1902.)

¹⁴ III, 9. *Neue Gedichte, I* (1907).

¹⁵ II, 57. *B. d. B., I. Buch, II. Teil.* (1902).

impression at which the entire little poem of nine lines aims (namely, the sense of a continuity within the poet's self, of time as a hinge between now and the immediate past, and the extension of that sense of continuity to all things and their images- "die Dinge und alle Bilder") this impression is already evoked by the opening, specifically by the unwasted initial notes, the anacrusis which Rilke refuses to waste:

Und wieder rauscht mein tiefes Leben lauter . . .

In this typical example, something is attained before the poem has begun. "Und wieder" enables the poetic experience to start *stante pede* on its level as a poetic experience, without having first to climb to it. A poem, although rounded in its outward plastic form, can thus remind us that, apart from its shape, it is of the *stuff* of all time and experience. Where the epic element is a strong undercurrent, as in the *Marien-Leben*, this becomes especially pronounced. "Und der Engel sprach und gab sich Mühe"¹⁶ emphasizes that this is one happening in a series. Similarly in *Sankt Georg*¹⁷ the story is so introduced that it seems an arbitrarily chosen point of beginning: "Und sie hatte ihm die ganze Nacht / angerufen." Actually this is meant to make us aware of a pre-history, to stir our sense of time. This opening forms the pattern which runs through the inner structure of the poem. Four successive sentences begin with *und*; around each sentence-nucleus a stanza has crystallized, giving a simple chain of events, linked among themselves by *und* and joined to the "backward and abyss of time" by the initial *und*.

Other vistas occasionally open. For instance, the beginning of the second of the *Sonnette an Orpheus* ("Und fast ein Mädchen wars und ging hervor"),¹⁸ where the link is obviously to the preceding sonnet and the *es* is the sound itself of Orpheus' song, seems to run back two decades, as if in a cross-tide, to an opening line in the middle book of *Das Stundenbuch*: "Und meine Seele ist ein Weib vor dir."¹⁹ This merely in passing.

¹⁶ II, 303 "Argwohn Josephs" (*Das Marien-Leben*, written 1912, publ. 1913.)

¹⁷ III, 217; in *Neue Gedichte, Anderer Teil* (written and publ., 1908).

¹⁸ III, 314; *Die Sonette an Orpheus, I. Teil, II.* (written 1922, publ. 1923).

¹⁹ II, 238; *Das Stunden-Buch, II. Buch: Das Buch der Pilgerschaft*

A final example of initial *Und* is its convincingly conscious use in the translation of Elizabeth Browning's Sonnets, especially in the first of them, where the original had: "I thought once how Theocritus had sung," but where Rilke, not content with the suddenness of this articulation, begins "Und es geschah mir einst, an Theokrit / zu denken, . . ." ²⁰ so that (in effect, and perhaps also in intent, not unlike the persistent beat of the opening movement of Brahms' First Symphony) we hear "time's winged chariot" and know again that what the poet is shaping is of a transcendent stuff out of larger experience.

Syntax and grammar are merely outward surveying instruments; the outlines they reveal are the result of inner layerings. On the grammatical level we see *und* as a conjunction and the likewise highly frequent *da* as an adverb; but on a higher level, in their initial setting, they are ligatures joining one moment in time to the stream of time. From the study of technique it is possible to rise to a realization of style. Ernst Elster long since pointed out the difference between the two: technique as "Handgriffe und Berechnungen," style as "Gestaltungskraft . . . aus dunklen Tiefen." ²¹ But in this connection it must be observed that an identity of outer structure and inner form is possible. It is appropriate to repeat what Hermann Weigand has already noted in "Das Wunder im Werk Rainer Maria Rilkes." ²² Regarding one instance of "Wunder" he remarks "dass der Satz selbst, als grammatisches Gebilde, das Wunder mitmacht." ²³

Obviously the opening line will indicate or forecast the rhythm. But besides determining inner structure or outer ligature, the *technique* of the opening is frequently to initiate the leading metaphor, which may, then, in deeper recesses, contain at least the germ of the central idea. A thorough-going analysis of opening metaphors is not possible here. In *Mädchenmelancholie* the first line ("Mir fällt ein junger Ritter ein") ²⁴ not only determines

(written 1901, publ. 1905). The second sonnet seems also to touch a passage in *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, v, 95 (begun 1904, finished 1910).

²⁰ vi, 7.

²¹ *Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft*, II. Bd. (Stilistik), Halle, 1911, p. 8.

²² *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht*, Jan. 1939, xxxi, 1, pp. 1-21.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

²⁴ II, 13. *B. d. B., I. Buch, I. Teil* (1901); publ. 1902).

fourteen of the nineteen end-rhymes; it presents the image "junger Ritter" which is the vehicle for the central idea. The whole background for *Aus einer Kindheit* and, augmented by alliteration, much of the mood is set by the opening: "Das Dunkeln war wie Reichtum in dem Raume, / darin der Knabe, sehr verheimlicht, sass. . ." ²⁵ Of the *Frühe Gedichte* one begins: "Ich will ein Garten sein," ²⁶ plunging immediately into the central metaphorical image, at once translatable for us also into the language of deeper psychological interpretation, for it typifies Rilke in his early self-expressive stage.

It is also in the opening line that Rilke exerts two of his most powerful devices: namely, anticipation and delay. Both aim at suspense. In *Abschied* the opening presents the maximum of anticipation: "Wie hab ich das gefühlt, was Abschied heisst." ²⁷ Is this not the *Endergebnis* of the poetic experience? What more is there? This opening pushes the experience so far into the past among completely finished emotional events, that only the reinvigorating second line ("Wie weiss ichs noch") can rescue it again. The apparently empty word *das* of the first line holds so much meaning "ganz klein zusammengefaltet . . . , wie ein italienisches Seidentuch in eine Nusschale" (to quote a phrase from an early letter) ²⁸ that the remainder seems for a moment deflated, and the reader thus spurred to equal the poet's experience in order to achieve this *das* for himself. Similarly, Hermann Weigand, though writing of quite another poem, observes: "Schon dieser erste Vers mit seinem hinweisenden 'das' zwingt das Auge, sich auf das Sehen einzustellen, wo noch nichts zu sehen ist." ²⁹

Retardation is the closely-related opposite of this anticipation. "Auf einmal ist aus allem Grün im Park / nun weiss nicht was, ein Etwas fortgenommen." ³⁰ "Auf einmal" has so speeded the action, that for the reader, from whom the scene is still hidden, the remainder is painfully delayed and the suspense "*Vor dem Som-*

²⁵ II, 31. For dates, s. above; on the phrase "Reichtum in dem Raume," cf. letter of 24. Jan. 1901 to Paula Becker, *Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 95, where we read: "unrechtmässiger Reichtum des Raumes."

²⁶ I, 257.

²⁷ III, 62. *Neue Gedichte, I. Teil* (1907).

²⁸ Letter of 23. Oct. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 57).

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

³⁰ III, 66. *Neue Ged.*, I.

merregen” is rendered oppressive. Is it anticipation or retardation when the opening “Das alles stand auf ihr und war die Welt”³¹ temporarily veils the identity of “das alles” and the principal figure as well? These instances have all been from *Neue Gedichte*, where the type seems especially pronounced, but a striking example occurs in *Erste Gedichte*. Rilke stands before a museum reproduction of the room where one Kajetan Tyl wrote the Bohemian anthem. “Da also hat der arme Tyl / sein Lied ‘Kde domov můj’ geschrieben.”³² Only the long prose subtitle, by explaining the situation, somewhat mitigates the irony of the *also*, by which the poet puts himself far deeper into the experience than his reader can yet be.

The importance of titles in conjunction with first lines deserves more attention than allowable here, for instance *Das Stundenbuch* and its opening: “Da neigt sich die Stunde und ruht mich an.”³³ *Leda, Der Tod Moses*³⁴ and others would be quite incomprehensible without the title, despite the presupposition of a cultivated reader, acquainted with the legend. The same is true where Rilke creates his own legend and magic, as in *Der Stifter* or *Der Goldschmied*.³⁵

When we have perceived the colorful urgency of “Ich will ein Garten sein” (*Frühe Gedichte*),³⁶ the plastic monotony in the vowel pattern of “Sein Blick ist vom Vorübergehn der Stäbe” (*Neue Gedichte*)³⁷ and heard the alliteration and assonance of one of the Sonnets, opening like a magic spell: “Irgendwo wohnt das Gold in der verwöhnenden Bank . . .”³⁸ where sound and sense combine, then we realize that a panorama of first lines substantiates Rilke’s transition through successive stages from impressionism to *Gestalt* and on to *mystische Sachlichkeit*.

Our aim has not been the presentation of empty forms, but discovery and communication of material saturated with the poet’s personality and which, through such communication, can be re-experienced by us. Perhaps we cannot realize how high is this

³¹ III, 58; as above.

³² I, 60. *Erste Gedichte; Larenopfer* (1896).

³³ II, 175. *Stundenbuch, I* (1899).

³⁴ III, 120 (*Neue Ged., Anderer Teil*, 1908) and III, 404 (*Letzte Ged. und Fragmentarisches*) respectively.

³⁵ III, 48 (*Neue Ged., I*) and III, 440 (*Letzte Ged. u. Fragm.*) respectively. Cf. H. Weigand, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 12 and 13.

³⁶ I, 257.

³⁷ III, 44 (*Neue Gedichte, I.*)

³⁸ III, 363 (*Die Sonette an Orpheus, II. Teil*. 1922, publ. 1923.)

degree of saturation until we draw upon the *Briefe und Tagebücher*. Out of phrases in them a poem sometimes springs to life. "Es ist eine Abendstunde. . . . Keine grosse goldene . . ." ³⁹ reminds us in its effect of many first lines (it has the cadence of "Keine weinende Frau," ⁴⁰ though that is not a first line). We think of the prominence of *kein* as a beginning word of many poems.⁴¹ *Kein* brings up *nicht*, *nichts* and *nie* and demands that we consider the opposite, *alle*, which in half a dozen cases is used to create a great space around the poem by a sort of sweeping, magic gesture. And all instances recall that the study of first lines only serves to emphasize the importance of concluding lines.

We find that the use of *es* in opening lines signifies more than the mere frequency of the impersonal in German, as in "Es war ein König in Thule" or Heine's "Es fällt ein Stern herunter." When Rilke writes "Es winkt zu Fühlung fast aus allen Dingen," ⁴² this is a part of himself, a conscious part even. Malte's *Aufzeichnungen* begin: "So, also hierher kommen die Leute, um zu leben, ich würde eher meinen, es stürbe sich hier." ⁴³ How revealing then these diary entries are: "Um sie (die Gefühle) zu bezeichnen, sagst du: ich bin . . . , nein, ich glaube, du sagst vielmehr: es ist . . . es ist z. B. ein Abend in einer Stube" ⁴⁴ and from this point Rilke spins out a long plot. And "immer öfter geschieht es mir, dass ich nicht sagen kann: ich bin, . . . sondern, dass ich sagen muss: es ist. . ." ⁴⁵

A first line is not a superficial façade but part of the inmost structure. ("Es gibt nichts Unwichtiges, nichts Unfestliches da. Jedes Wort, das mitgehen darf im Triumphzug des Verses, muss schreiten, und das Kleinste darf dem Grössten nicht nachstehen an äusserer Würde und Schönheit.") ⁴⁶ Rilke's awareness of the weight of the opening line becomes evident when he writes: "Ich habe nur

³⁹ Letter of 18. Oct. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 54).

⁴⁰ "Ist ein Schloss. Das vergehende" is the first line of the poem in *Frühe Gedichte* (Werke I, 287) where the quoted line occurs.

⁴¹ E. g., II, 45: "Die Aschanti" (*B. d. B., I. Buch, II. Teil*); "Klage um Antinous" (*Neue Ged., And. Teil*) III, 125.

⁴² III, 452 (*Letzte Ged. u. Fragm.*)

⁴³ v, 7.

⁴⁴ *Tagebücher*, 3. Nov. 1899 (*Briefe u. Tageb. 1899-1902*, p. 204).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 205 Cf. *Requiem für eine Freundin* (Paula Becker-Moder-sonn): "nicht: das bin ich; nein: dies ist" (II, 326).

⁴⁶ Letter to Axel Junker, 7. Nov. 1901. (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 115.) Cf. also *Frühe Ged.* I, 260.

eines mitgelebt am ganzen Abend, das war das Goethe-Gedicht mit dem grossen geheimnisvollen Anfang."⁴⁷

By selected examples we have attempted to see whether, out of manifold forms, something like a fundamental compositional principle can be derived, whether opening lines provide a useful vehicle of interpretation, in other words: a hermeneutic principle. The answer is not certain, but the indications are that such a study moves us a step forward toward the discovery of such a principle in Rilke's lyricism.

Certain it is that the opening line had functional significance for Rilke. It is so pregnant a part of his poetry that through it he increases the inner resiliency. The opening line is like an iron rim around a bursting content. It is a line as important for Rilke's sense of form, for his "conciseness, economy, force, mass" as the heavy outlines Giotto put about the figures in his frescoes.

HERMAN SALINGER

The University of Wisconsin

RILKE—RODIN: A CORRECTION

The details of R. M. Rilke's life are well known and have been presented in a number of books, but there is one fact usually reported about Rilke's relationship to the French sculptor Auguste Rodin which needs correcting; i. e., the assertion that Rilke was Rodin's secretary.¹ Statements to that effect appeared even in Rilke's life-time. He called them 'obstinate legends' and tried to correct them himself. In a letter to Dr. A. Schaer, published in R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus Muzot*, Insel, 1936, he writes: "Dass ich Rodins Sekretär gewesen sei, ist nicht viel mehr als eine hartnäckige Legende, erwachsen aus dem Umstande, dass ich ihm einmal, vorübergehend, während 5 Monaten(!), in seiner Kor-

⁴⁷ *Tagebücher*, 10. Sept. 1900 (*Briefe 1899-1902*, p. 289).

Rilke refers to: "So lasst mich scheinen, bis ich werde . . ."

¹ Cf. *Historical Survey of German Literature* by Sol Liptzin, Prentice-Hall, 1936, p. 207; *Deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit* by Ernst Rose, Prentice-Hall, 1930, p. 222; *George, Hoffmannsthal, Rilke* by Martin Sommerfeld, New York, W. W. Norton, 1940, p. 29; *Rainer Maria Rilke* by Katharina Kippenberg, Leipzig, Insel, 1938, p. 142; *R. M. Rilke* by E. M. Butler, Cambridge Un. Press, 1941, p. 160.

respondenz behilflich war. . . . Aber sein Schüler bin ich viel besser und viel länger gewesen" (p. 246).

There is good reason why Rilke disliked being called Rodin's secretary. The term secretary denotes a relationship which Rilke resented, for even when he first met Rodin, at the age of 27, he felt that he was a master in his own right. Being an artist he naturally admired Rodin's work and was attracted by the personality of the great sculptor. Thus he became in more than one sense Rodin's pupil.

Perhaps the greatest single idea which Rilke owes to Rodin—he learned it more by watching the master at work than by talking to him—is that work, hard and patient work, is the secret of all great art. 'Il faut-travailler, toujours travailler' was Rodin's credo as he expressed it in *Les Cathédrales de France*, and again 'le travail est mystérieux. Il accorde beaucoup aux patients et aux simples, il refuse aux pressés et aux vaniteux.'

From that time on we find in Rilke's own work a much greater awareness of the value of workmanship than he had before he met Rodin. In the *Requiem* he severely condemns those poets—like himself in his earlier work—who only pour out their feelings and changing moods, who think they must write a poem about everything that arouses their joy or sadness, instead of:

hart sich in die Worte zu verwandeln,
wie sich der Steinmetz einer Kathedrale
verbissen umsetzt in des Steines Gleichmut.

In a letter to M. Verhaeren whom he also knew in Paris and whom he much admired, Rilke talks of 'cette impitoyable évocation au travail qui nuit et jour réclame notre amour' (March 22, 1907). And, finally, in a letter to Rodin he compares the writing of prose to the building of a cathedral, 'la prose veut être bâtie comme une cathédrale.'² All these are pictures and ideas which clearly show Rodin's influence. They strengthen Rilke's claim that he was Rodin's pupil rather than his secretary. As a pupil he revered the old master and tried to help him, no doubt, with any odd job the latter wanted him to do. But this still does not make him Rodin's secretary. It is a small point, to be sure, but it brings a false note into a very human relationship.

H. F. PETERS

Reed College

² Dec. 20, 1908.

NORMAN HISTORY IN THE "LAY OF THE BEACH"

(Strandar ljóð)

In the Old-Norwegian *Strengleikar*,¹ thirteenth-century translation of a lost French or Anglo-French manuscript miscellany of so-called Breton lays, made by an unknown cleric in the service of Hákon Hákonsson, king of Norway from 1217 to 1263, the "Lay of Gurun" (*Guruns ljóð*) and the "Lay of the Beach" (*Strandar ljóð*) are of special importance and interest to students of the Breton lay² and of Old-Norwegian literature on several counts. First

¹ In J. R. Keyser and C. R. Unger, edd., *Strengleikar eða Ljóðabók—En Samling af romantiske Fortællinger efter bretonske Folkesange (Lais), oversat fra Fransk paa Norsk ved Midten af trettende Aarhundrede efter Foranstaltning af Kong Haakon Haakonson* (Oslo, 1850), where *Guruns ljóð* ("Lay of Gurun") is No. xi (pp. 57-61, Notes, p. 114), *Strandar ljóð* ("Lay of the Beach") is No. xiv (pp. 67-8; Notes, pp. 118-9). There is a Norwegian translation by Henrik Winter-Hjelm, *Strenglege eller Sangenes Bog, oversat fra Oldnorsk* (Oslo, 1850), pp. 100-07 ("Guruns Sang"), pp. 118-20 ("Strandens Sang"). Some of this material is apparently translated into French by Mathieu Auguste Geffroy, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits concernant l'histoire ou la littérature de la France qui sont conservés dans les bibliothèques ou archives de Suède, Danemark et Norvège* (Paris, 1855-6), though at the time of writing I have not been able to examine this work; there is, it may be noted, a French translation of the fragmentary beginning of *Leikara ljóð* (ed. cit., p. 68), together with some interesting comment, in *Revue celtique* xxviii (1898), 328-9. The promise of a complete German translation of the *Strengleikar*, made by Kail Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France* ("Bibliotheca Normannica," Vol. iii, 2d ed., Halle, 1900), p. xxxix, n. 1, does not appear to have been fulfilled; at any rate, the promise is withdrawn in Warnke's 3d ed. (Halle, 1925), pp. lxi-ii. There is an outline of the "Lay of Gurun" and of the "Lay of the Beach" in Axel Ahlström, *Studier i den fornfranska Lais-Litteraturen* (Uppsala, 1892), pp. 154-5, and in H. G. Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), pp. 218-22; briefer outlines in Warnke, 3d ed., p. xxviii. For translations of the "Foreword," "Lay of Gurun," "Lay of the Beach of Barfleur," and "Ricar the Old" see H. M. Smyser and F. P. Magoun, Jr., *Survivals in Old Norwegian from Medieval English, French and German Literature, together with the Latin versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine* (Connecticut College Monograph No. 1) (Baltimore; Waverly Press, 1941), pp. 38-49.

² In general see Warnke, 3d ed., Introduction; also Ernst Hoeffpner, *Les Lais de Marie de France*, Paris, 1935.

and foremost, the French texts, of whose one-time existence there can be no reasonable doubt,³ are lost and are only represented in the *Strengleikar*; today these Norwegian translations must thus serve as originals. In the second place, these two lays are unusual in that both appear to be composed around historical events⁴ rather than around a folktale or love-story.⁵ Thirdly, not only are they not Breton in their geographical and historical setting but, judged by their narratives, are clearly in *fons et origo* essentially Scottish and Norman respectively. Finally, the *Strengleikar* constitute a significant element in the corpus of Old-Norwegian translation-literature, especially because they include lays that appear no longer to survive in French,⁶ a feature that puts this work in a class with *Þrðreks*

³ I translate here from the Norwegian's Foreword (*ed. cit.*, *Forræða*, p. 1, ll. 19-25): "And this book, which the worshipful King Hákon caused to be translated into Norwegian from French, can be called a "Book of Lays" (*Ljóða bók*), for from those stories which this book reveals, the poets in More Southern Britain [i. e. Brittany], which is in France, composed songs in verse which are performed on harps, robes, drums, wind instruments, tamburines, psalteries, and "choruses" and all kinds of stringed instruments which men make for themselves and for others for secular diversion." There can be little doubt that the Norwegian translator is here referring to a single French manuscript; see Rudolf Meissner, *Die Strengleikar: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. altnordisch. Prosalitteratur* (Halle, 1902), p. 199. That this lost French manuscript stood in certain respects in close relationship to British Museum, *Ms. Harley 978* has been pointed out by Warnke, pp. lxi-ii (abbreviated "II") and, with certain modifications, by Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 200; the only other big lay miscellany is Warnke's "S" (pp. ix-xi), Bibliothèque nationale, *Ms. nouv. acq. franç. 1104*. See also Ezio Levi, *Maria di Francia: Eliduo* (Florence, 1924), pp. lxxv-vi and lxxxix.

⁴ Thus inviting a certain comparison with the *Lai d'Havelok*; see W. W. Skeat—Kenneth Sisam, *The Lay of Havelok the Dane* (2d ed., Oxford, 1915 and later printings), pp. xii-xv, xxv-vi, and Ferd. Holthausen, *Havelok* (3d ed., Heidelberg, 1928), pp. xiii-iv. Here, however, the history, if not quite "no history at all" (so Sisam, p. xxvi), is apparently vastly more altered than in the "Lay of the Beach" or even in the "Lay of Gurun."

⁵ Cp. Hoepffner, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 ff.; Warnke, p. lii (quoting Foulet).

⁶ Apart from *Guruns ljóð* and *Strandar ljóð* there are two other quite fragmentarily preserved lays not represented in French: *Rícar hinn gamli* (*ed. cit.*, pp. 82-3) with the familiar elements of the *vieux jaloux* and the *mal mariée*, and another (pp. 84-9), whose setting is near Piacenza (Italy); without manuscript title one might think of this latter as a second *Tveggja Elskanda ljóð* (cp. p. 89, 20) or even as *Snjófalls ljóð* (cp. p. 88, 17); see

saga;⁷ *Tristrams saga ok Isondar*,⁸ and finally with *Landres þáttur* in *Karlamagnús saga* which preserves an otherwise lost Middle-English romance that might be entitled *Olive and Landres*.⁹

The "Lay of the Beach," offering a simpler and hence more compactly presentable historical problem of the two, will be discussed here.¹⁰ Its text is not, properly speaking, that of a lay; it tells us, rather, of the circumstances under which an unpreserved lay of this title came to be composed and furnishes us with quite precise indications of its immediate *mise en scène*: Barfleur (dépt. Manche), near Cherbourg on the north coast of the Norman peninsula. The text is so short that a complete translation may well be given.

THE LAY OF THE BEACH

Now after this¹¹ it is fitting for us to set forth that which is called the "Lay of the Beach," (explain) how it begins.

King William, who attacked England, caused this lay to be composed. When he had got everything under his control and had put sentries in charge of the Border, then he went back and boarded a ship at Southampton

further Ernst Brugger, *Zs. f. franz. Spr. u. Litteratur* XLIX (1926-7), 474-5. For discussion and brief outlines see Ahlström, *op. cit.*, p. 156 ("Ricar") and Leach, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-4.

⁷ Notably, *inter alia*, for its preservation of portions of an otherwise lost state of the *Nibelungenlied*; see Andreas Heusler, *Nibelungensage u. Nibelungenlied* (3d ed., Dortmund, 1929), *passim*, and Mary Thorp, *The Study of the Nibelungenlied, being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937* (Oxford, 1940), pp. 70 ff., 92 ff. For a translation of the passage corresponding to the *Nibelunge Nôt* see Smyser-Magoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 ff.

⁸ Cp. Wolfgang Golther, *Tristan u. Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters u. der neuen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 182 ff., esp. p. 183, n. 1.

⁹ See H. M. Smyser, "The Middle-English and Old Norse Story of Olive," *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 69-84. For a translation of this text see Smyser-Magoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-27.

¹⁰ The "Lay of Gurun," giving apparently a romantically confused picture of Scottish history between the years 1107-18 (in the reign of Alexander I), is the subject of a forthcoming paper in *Studia Neophilologica*.

¹¹ By "after this" (*Pesso nest*, 67, 8) is meant the immediately preceding lay, *Geita(r)lauf*, "honeysuckle" or "woodbine" (Marie's *Chievrefeuil*, Warnke, 3d ed., pp. 181 ff.).

(Ha.), because he had learned that almost all landed men who owned castles within the boundary of Normandy were in revolt against him and were assailing his rule. So he turned his wrath against them and gathered a great host against them and a numerous army from his lands. When he came to Normandy, he besieged and destroyed their castles and rebuilt [them] as best pleased him and attacked them all and thoroughly pacified all his kingdom and gave merited punishment to those who had been bad and had broken the peace. When he had stayed some little time in his domain, then he was again eager to journey across the English Channel and went to the town of Barfleur and stayed there a very long time. And he went every day with goshawks and hunted cranes and caught a great number. And he remained there a very long time waiting for a favorable wind, and a great fleet was assembled there to transport his army. And the king was unwilling to accept the advice of the captains and hurry out into unsettled weather; on the contrary, he stayed on there a very long time on account of the diversion, which pleased him so well and delighted him greatly.

Then he reflected with due consideration that he would dispatch his emissaries with a letter into Brittany to that Red Lady who knew the nature of all lays and had always engaged in this kind of entertainment and had taken great pains about it from her childhood, (the message being to the effect) that she should compose for him a new lay with the fairest melody that her versatile knowledge could devise and to send it quickly to him by these emissaries who brought this message to her, "and it is to be called the 'Lay of the Beach.'" By this lay he wishes to remember, and always to be reminded of, that entertaining sojourn which he made on the beach of Barfleur, waiting for a favorable wind.

Then he sent into Brittany all the best harpers who were with him and with them rich gifts and offerings of royal liberality. When they had come to her in Brittany, bringing her rich offerings of the king's generosity, she received these with great pleasure and many thanks. Then there elapsed a brief interval of time. Then she composed the lay which the king had requested of her through his letter and emissaries and instructed the harpers and taught them the "Lay of the Beach." When they came back to the king with great joy and pleasant merriment because they had well and quickly executed everything that they had desired, they then had to perform the lay in the presence of the king and his favorites and courtiers. And those who were connoisseurs said that they had never before heard so good a lay as this. And since the king claimed to prefer this especially to all lays, accordingly no harper or minstrel pretends to be competent unless he knows how to perform this well and perfectly. And this [lay] went the rounds of all the courts of kings and dukes and nobles. And there was no consort of duke or earl, or other great ladies, who did not claim to be pleased with that lay. And even in our days there are many who call this the favorite lay and [worthiest] of a king's entertainment.

Now I have read no further in the French language about this lay and I shall add absolutely nothing except that may God bless, honor, keep, and

dignify the king who had this book translated into Norwegian as a delightful diversion for the present generation and for the one to come. And may He show mercy to him who wrote this. Amen.

The actual composition of this reputedly beautiful and popular lay is attributed to a certain Red Lady of Brittany, but the Norman subject and the Norman scene are prescribed for her by William, Duke of Normandy and Conqueror and King of England. The main narrative hinges on an episode, evidently historical, namely, one of the several journeys made by William from England to the Continent in the years following 1072, quite likely that of the year 1073, when he put down the serious revolt of Maine, adjoined province south of Normandy. At the outset much is made of his getting everything under his control and of his posting sentinels on the "border" (*lanndamære*, 67, 11), evidently the Scottish Border, and this would seem almost certainly to refer to his vigorous and successful campaign late in 1072 into Scotland, at the end of which he received homage from Malcolm III at the little town of Abernethy (Perthshire).¹² In 1073, after having settled affairs north of the Border, William set out at once for the Continent and suppressed the revolt of Maine, as mentioned above. The lay, it is true, speaks of revolt as occurring in Normandy not in Maine, but in 1063 William had effected the important conquest of Maine¹³ and, consequently, Maine may naturally enough have been regarded as part of Normandy by the author of the lay. The revolt of Maine in 1073¹⁴ had been a serious affair and was especially noteworthy on account of William's use of large numbers of English soldiery,¹⁵ a feature of this campaign almost surely reflected in the remarks in the lay about a "numerous army from his lands" (*fjōlmennilegan her ór lōndum sínum*, 67, 15) and a "great fleet" (*mikill skipafjōlde*, 67, 23) necessary to transport it back home. The "beach," that of the once important Channel port of Barfleur (dép. Manche), 25 km. due E of Cherbourg, is not mentioned by contemporary historians in the present connection, but there is no special reason to doubt that this was the point of embarkation for the return journey. The long, very long, sojourn at Barfleur may

¹² Ed. A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes* (rev. American ed., Oxford, 1873), iv, 349-52.

¹³ *Ibid.*, iii, 135 ff., esp. pp. 143-44.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, iv, 389 ff.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, iv, 378 and note 5.

likewise well be historical, unless by chance this much stressed feature of the story has been colored by, or somehow confused with, the very famous and exceedingly vexatious delay suffered by William as a result of adverse winds during August and September 1066 when he was waiting, first at Dives-Cabourg (départ. Calvados), later at St.-Valéry (départ. Somme), to set sail for his conquest of England.¹⁶

It is perhaps impossible to prove absolutely that the expedition of 1073 against Maine furnishes the background of the "Lay of the Beach," but it strikes me as considerably more likely than any of the several other journeys which William made to the Continent. For example, the journey of 1072 to Normandy, though obscure in many respects,¹⁷ does not seem to have involved the type of military action implied in the lay, nor had, at that time, the pacification of the north of Britain just been effected as the lay implies. In 1076 William laid ineffective siege to Dol (départ. Ille-et-Vilaine) in Brittany,¹⁸ an action clearly not reflected in the lay. In 1077 William made a short-lived peace with the king of France but soon was faced by the open rebellion of his eldest son Robert. The strife involved was long drawn out,¹⁹ occurred several years after the settling of the situation on the Border in 1072,²⁰ and did not involve the transport on any important scale of English troops to France.

Taking it all in all, I see no good reason for doubting that the "Lay of the Beach" reflects rather closely William's campaign against Maine in 1073, heavily supported by an English army.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

THE BURDEN IN CAROLS

"The burden," says Dr. Greene in his *Early English Carols*,¹ "makes and marks the carol. The presence of an invariable line or group of lines which is to be sung before the first stanza and after

¹⁶ Cp. Freeman, III, 257-65.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, IV, 431-33.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 367-68.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, esp. pp. 433-41.

²⁰ Indeed, Robert actually aided William in his second campaign against Malcolm during a brief period of reconciliation between father and son in 1080 (Freeman, IV, 441).

¹ Oxford 1935; p. cxxxiii.

all stanzas is a feature which distinguishes the carol from all other forms of Middle English lyric." MS evidence for the repetition of the burden after every stanza is found in over a hundred texts where the first few words are written out following each stanza.² Tabulation of the texts in this indispensable volume shows that 72% of the burdens consist of two short lines; this was probably the original form.³ Only eighteen burdens have one line,⁴ and of the longer burdens Dr. Greene computes "111 in all, including those in which the burden is a couplet repeated."⁵

The following notes will clear up, I hope, a few difficulties, mainly editorial, presented by the burdens of carols in B. M. MS Additional 5665, a collection of religious and secular songs. The "Ritson MS," as it is generally called, was designed for use by a sophisticated group able to read music—incidentally the songs are written on verso and following recto so that they could be sung without turning the page. This music, however, sets no standard for the popular performance of carols, essentially a non-learned *genre*. The words of most of the burdens of the carols in this MS appear twice, first with music for two parts and then again with music for three parts. Only two carols lack this repeated burden at the head.⁶ In twenty-nine carols the burden is a couplet repeated.⁷ In these cases, Dr. Greene scrupulously follows the MS and prints the burden as a single four-line unit, apparently assuming that the couplet is to be sung twice over—this is implicit in his remark, nowhere further elucidated, that "the burden is a couplet repeated." This procedure is confusing for two reasons. From a musical standpoint, the repetition of words alone has no significance.⁸ From a literary standpoint, the essential simple carol-form

² Indicated in the various footnotes in Greene; 116 texts in all, including 27 from Balliol 354; 17 from Kele; and 9 from BM Addit. 5465. The burden is written in full after at least one stanza (indicated in others by a few words) in Nos. 322A, 426a and 461.

³ See "The Earliest Carols," *MLN.*, LIII, 239-45.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. cxxxviii.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. cxxxviii, footnote 3.

⁶ Greene No. 307 (three parts only); 96 (two parts only; "*Te Eternum*" is a 'faburdon').

⁷ Greene Nos. 31, 57, 58, 59, 85, 89, 91, 99, 103, 109, 110, 111, 116, 118, 131, 133, 186, 259, 277, 306, 330, 337c, 348, 354, 359B, 367, 375, 387, 435.

⁸ Fehr in *Archiv OVI* notes the number of parts or voices for each line

of couplet burden (and in some cases quatrain stanzas) is complicated without warrant. A more plausible view is that the two arrangements are alternative, that is, one or the other to be sung, according to the occasion or the ability of the performers, but never to be sung concurrently.

Disregard of the musical indications and of established stanzaic arrangement leads to a serious misinterpretation of the form of No. 59 in the *Early English Carols*, which Dr. Greene prints as two six-line tail-rime stanzas with a four-line burden. My arrangement, following the MS, restores the typical two-line burden (BB) and the common carol quatrain (aaab), and gives a further example of a burden written out in full after a stanza.⁹ It has frequently been suggested that the rime of refrain lines, when the same as the burden, served as a signal for the singing of the burden.¹⁰ Such a view is amply supported by the music of this carol, and of others in the Ritson MS. Here the refrain has the same music, as well as the same words, as the first half of the burden; and the music for the burden repeated after the first stanza is the same as that for the burden at the head.¹¹ I restore the quatrain rime scheme by supplying 'word,' an insertion which is not opposed by the music.¹² It should be noted that the second

by the symbols *a*, *b*, *c*. The editing of Elizabethan madrigals presents a similar problem, where often each part has its own words written in full; the duty of the editor is not to reproduce the strings of words but to present a literary form. Greene notes the music for one text on p. lviii. I would accept a date earlier than the first quarter of the xvi century for this collection of carols; the handwriting of the Latin note on f. 61^a (dated 1510) is later than that of the carols.

⁹ In the same way, I take Greene No. 0 to be a quatrain type (aaab) with a single 'Nowell' as the refrain: this is the way stanzas 2 and 3 are written. In the arrangement of the first stanza (written under the music), the following 'Nowells' are in two groups of four, the first with music for two parts and the second with music for three parts. The two part music is precisely the same as that for the 'Nowell nowell nowell nowell' line of the head burden; and it may be that the 'Nowells' following the stanza indicate the repetition of the burden. The refrain 'Nowell' is written on the last line of f. 9^a, and repeated for convenience of singing (the music is the same) at the head of f. 9^b—this would help avoid any interruption in the musical performance.

¹⁰ So Greene, *op. cit.*, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

¹¹ Very slight variations in the music for the first three words. See also Greene Nos. 91A, 103e, 330, 337c, 367, 387.

¹² Assumption of scribal error is justified by slips in other texts in this

stanza, written without music at the bottom of f. 52^b, has three riming lines bracketed by the refrain at the side. Here, then, is my corrected version:

BM Addit 5665

f. 52^b

Blessed mote þ^u be swete ihūs
qui hodie natus es nobis

By thi burthe þ^u blessed lord
ys made of variaunce now on acorde
therfor we may shyng this [word]
Blessed mote þ^u be swete ihūs

f. 53^a

Blessed mote þ^u be swete ihūs
Qui hodie [natus es nobis]

Vpon this heygh blessed day
Ihū in hys moderes armys lay
Wherfor to hym lete vus all say
Blessed mote þ^u be swete ihūs

f. 52^b

[Blessed mote þ^u be swete ihūs
qui hodie natus es nobis]

Smert

In the same way the burden of Greene's No. 367 is written out in full in the MS after the first stanza, a quatrain; there is no need to postulate a repeated couplet burden. In No. 464, a three-part carol in another Tudor songbook, the "Fairfax MS" (BM Addit. 5465), Dr. Greene prints the four-line burden three times, making a twelve-line burden. The two other voices are given the burden only once, and again it seems that this presentation is not only non-popular but possibly unique. In other MSS where the words of the burden are written in full for several parts, Dr. Greene naturally prints the single form.¹⁸ By removing carols with repeated burdens from the total of 111, the number is reduced to about seventy texts with burdens of over two lines, a number which indeed gives far more support to Dr. Greene's own thesis; for we can now state that 81% of all carols have burdens of two short lines.

MS. Greene No. 118, st. 1, v. 3 "Whe founde" is written under the line; st. 2, v. 2 "virginite" is not cancelled as it needs to be. Greene No. 57 has exactly the same form as this text—single 2-line burden and two quatrains—and here the words of the first line are "hopelessly corrupt."

¹⁸ Greene Nos. 144, 150D, 437, 448, 463, 465, 466. There are two carols with repeated couplet burdens in Arch. Selden B. 26—Nos. 18b and 33.

A slight emendation brings another carol (No. 323) into the regular quatrain with refrain type in all its stanzas. In the first stanza it is evident that the scribe has written the refrain as the first instead of the fourth line. A similar slip in the following carol in the same MS, where the rime word is shifted from its proper position,¹⁴ gives further justification for this correction of the scribe's carelessness. I read the first quatrain of No. 323, therefore, as follows:

Porkington 10

f. 198^a

Mett y whyte Ihū to chyrcheward gone
 Petur and Pawle thomas & Ihon
 And hys descyplys Eucry-chone
 And By a chapell as y Came

The pointing of the burden by typographical devices is convenient for indicating carol form. On the other hand, we should beware of printing in this manner of burden and quatrain what is in an altogether different literary form. "When Fortune list" was accurately described by Carleton Brown twenty years ago as a rondel;¹⁵ but in his later *Religious Lyrics of the XV Century*¹⁶ it appears without such mention, and moreover arranged as a carol with burden (in smaller type) and quatrains. Rondels are of such rare occurrence in Middle English verse that it is too bad that Dr. Brown did not bring out this unusual form more clearly: apart from the 102 rondels by Charles d'Orleans (all of which, however, are translations or imitations from his own French) there are only twelve Middle English rondels, including four by Chaucer and four by Hoccleve.¹⁷ "When Fortune list" provides an inter-

¹⁴ Greene No. 124, st. 9, v. 3 (f. 190^b): "þer yn to wonny þer yn to dwell." The Porkington MSS are now on permanent loan to the National Library of Wales. Compare also "As I cowthe walke etc." printed by Brown, *MLN.*, xxxiii, 415-7, st. 1, vv. 6, 7 transposed with consequent destruction of rime scheme.

¹⁵ *A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse*, Oxford 1916, 1920, II. No. 2527.

¹⁶ Oxford 1939, pp. 259-60.

¹⁷ Rondels in Middle English:

(A) Associated with Charles d'Orleans:

(1) to (8) in the Grenoble and Paris (Bibl. nat. fr. 25458) MSS; ed. MacCracken, *PMLA.*, xxvi; (9) and (10) in Royal 16 F ii prob-

esting contrast to the foregoing carol (Greene's No. 59); in both the length is fourteen lines, but in the rondel the two refrain lines (AB) are not outside and detachable but an integral part of the stanza:

Cambridge University Ff 1 6

f. 53^b

When fortune list yewe here assent
 What is too deme þat may be doo
 There schapeth nought from her entent
 ffor as sche will it goth ther to
 All passith by her iugement
 The hy astate the pore all-so
 When ffortune [list yewe here assent
 [What is too deme þat may be doo]
 To lyve in ioy out of turment
 Seyng the worlde goth too and fro
 Thus is my schoit aviseament
 As hyt comyth so lete it go
 When ffortune [list yewe here assent
 [What is too deme þat may be doo]

ably by the Duke of Suffolk; *loc. cit.*, pp. 178-9; (11) to (102) ninety-one items in Harley 682, *ed. Rowburghe Club*, pp. 137-90.

(B) Chaucer:

(1) to (3) 'Merciles Beaute,' a triad of rondels in Pepys 2006, p. 390 (xvii century transcript in BM Addit. 38179, II, f. 51^a; printed frequently; (4) "Now welcome somer with thy sonne softe," inserted in two MSS of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules* between st. 97 and 98; printed very frequently.

(C) Hoccleve:

(5) "Somer þat rypest mannes sustenance," Huntington HM 111, f. 39^b; printed often, *c. g.*, *EEETS*. lxi, 60; (6) to (8) Three double rondels in Huntington HM 744, ff. 53^a-54^b: "Wel may I pleyne on yow Lady Moneye," "Hoccleue I wole it to thee knowen be," and "Of my lady wel me reioise I may"; printed *Academy* 1892, I, 542; Gollancz, *EEETS*. lxxiii, 35-8; Hammond, *Eng. Verse*, p. 68.

(D) Others:

(9) "Sovereigne lord welcome to your citee," inserted in Lydgate's verse account of Henry VI's entry into London in MSS Cotton Cleop. C iv, f. 38^a; Cotton Julius B ii, f. 89^b; Harley 565, f. 114^b; London Guildhall 3133, f. 132^b; Longleat. The rondel only is printed by Schleich, *Archiv*. xcvi, 191-4; Cohen, *Lyric Forms from France*, p. 69; Ellis, *Fabyan's Chronicle* 1811, p. 604; (10) "When Fortune list yewe here assent," discussed here; (11) "Fresshest of colour and most amiable," Trinity Coll. Cambridge 600, p. 373; unpublished; (12) "Rejoise ye reames of Englonde and of Fraunce," Harley 7333, f. 32^b; printed Wright, *Pol. Poems*, II, 140; Ritson, *Anc. Songs* 1829, I, 128; Guest, *Hist. English Rhythms*, p. 646; MacCracken, *EEETS*. 192, 622.

"There blows a colde wynde todaye" is treated by Dr. Greene as a carol (No. 170). In spite of the fact, as Dr. Greene points out to me, that the first four lines are unbracketed and without the stanza sign (the common indication of the burden) I prefer to regard the first four lines in this instance as the first stanza. The form (even the refrain "To kepe the cold wynd awaye") is identical with that of the other stanzas, and the sense is improved.¹⁸

To offset the loss of this text to the corpus of carols I add the following new carols not mentioned by Dr. Greene or his reviewers:

(1) Gabriell off hye degre

Hunterian MS 83, f. 11^b—six stanzas only and burden '*Noua noua / Auc fit ew Eua.*' With music. A variant text of Greene No 238. Not published.

(2) All heyle Mary and well þou be

Hunterian MS 83, f. 21^a—five quatrains and burden '*Salve sancta parens.*' With music. Not published.

(3) It fell ageyns the next nyght

Royal 19 B iv, f. 97^b—six quatrains and burden '*Pax uobis quod the Fox / For I am comyn to toowne.*' Not published.

(4) Our shyp is launched from the grounde

Trinity College Dublin MS 516, f. 30^a—twenty quatrains and burden '*Stere welle the good shype / god be our gyde.*' Printed by Madden, *Archaeologia* xxxix, 326-30. Dr. Greene informs me that he did not accept this as a carol until after his book was at press.

(5) O lord so swett ser Iohn dothe kys

Huntington MS EL 1160, f. 11^a—five quatrains and burden '*hey noyney I wyll loue our ser Iohn / & I loue eny.*' I am indebted to Dr. Herbert C. Schulz of the Henry E. Huntington Library for information on this and the following carol. Not published.

(6) I must go walke þe woad so wyld

Huntington MS EL 1160, f. 11^b—four 5-line stanzas: the burden is lacking. Not published.

(7) Galawnt pride thy father ys dede

Bodleian 14528 (Rawlinson poet. 34), f. 4^b—ten quatrains and burden (repeated again at end) '*Huff a galawnt vylabele / Thus syngyth galawntes in here revele.*' Printed by Furnivall, *The Academy*, Aug. 20, 1896.

ROSSELL HOPE ROBBINS

New York

¹⁸ See further Greene, *ELH.*, vii, 226 on No. 142.

In the same way there is no support for printing in carol form "What why dedist þou wynk whan þou a wyf toke" (Bodl. 29734) in *Percy Soc.* xxxiii, 35; it consists of four quatrains. Not included by Greene.

JOHN GOWER AND THE *DE GENEALOGIA DEORUM*

Speculations as to the possibility of John Gower's having used Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* in the composition of his *Confessio Amantis* presuppose that, although there are no indications that Gower himself visited Italy, he might well have encountered the manuscript of Boccaccio's compendium¹ in the hands of some friend returning from abroad.

Mr. G. C. Macaulay, in his edition of the *Confessio Amantis*, has indicated the following pieces of evidence as suggesting a connection between Gower's work and Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum*: the seemingly unparalleled confusion of the Graiae with the Gorgons;² the similarity of the images used by both writers in the story of Narcissus;³ the awareness of the separate identities of Brexeida and Criseida;⁴ and the story that it was of the slaying of Phocus that Peleus was purified by Achastus.⁵ Of these, the last two are found in so many other works that they are insignificant as evidence of a connection between Gower and Boccaccio's handbook. Incidentally, in the story of Narcissus, both Gower and Boccaccio refer to the *pity* of the nymphs, whereas only their *grief* is mentioned in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*⁶ and in the *Ovide Moralisé*.⁷

In addition to the points of similarity referred to by Mr. Macaulay, I have found several resemblances that seem significant.

¹ Of the thirty or forty extant apographs dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the first was apparently made in 1370 or early in 1371. See Ernest H. Wilkins, *Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature*, Chicago, 1923, p. 315, and *The University of Chicago Manuscript of the Genealogia deorum gentilium of Boccaccio*, Chicago, 1927, pp. 4-5.

² *De Genealogia Deorum*, 1511 (in Latin), x 10, and *Confessio Amantis*, in *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, Oxford, Vol. II, 1901, I 405 ff. See Macaulay, II 468 (note on I 389).

³ *De Gen.* VII 59, and *Conf.* I 2316-7. See Macaulay, II 475 (note on I 2316 f.).

⁴ *De Gen.* XII 52, and *Conf.* II 2455-6. See Macaulay, II 489 (note on II 2451 ff.).

⁵ *De Gen.* XII 50, and *Conf.* III 2551-7. See Macaulay, II 500 (note on III 2555).

⁶ *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon*, ed. Hugo Magnus, Berlin, 1914, III 505-8.

⁷ *Ovide Moralisé*, ed. C. de Boer, Tome I, Amsterdam, 1915, III 1834.

In his note upon Gower's use of the name "Namplus," Mr. Macaulay comments,⁸ "it would seem that our author had before him also some other form of the story, where he found the name 'Nauplius,' or 'Nauplus,' which he read 'Nanplus' or 'Namplus.'" The *De Genealogia Deorum*⁹ uses the suggested form, "Nauplius," and thus is a possible source, as are also Hyginus¹⁰ and Apollodorus.¹¹ But in Constans' ed. of the *Roman de Troie* one MS reads 'Namplus.'

The story of Demophon and Phillis, Mr. Macaulay states,¹² is "Partly from Ovid . . . but there was probably some other source, for our author would not find anything in Ovid about the transformation into a tree." Gower writes that Phillis

Was schape into a Notetre.¹³

In the *De Genealogia Deorum*, we find "in amigdalum . . . versa est."¹⁴ Of the other mythographers¹⁵ whom I have consulted, Servius¹⁶ alone gives the story in this form and was probably the source of Boccaccio's version. However, Gower gives no apparent indications of having had access to Servius and seems to have obtained the story through Boccaccio, since I have discovered no other channel of transmission.

In the story of Tantalus, Gower's phraseology and his concise though full treatment¹⁷ are much more similar to Boccaccio's¹⁸ than to the handling of the story by Ovid,¹⁹ Hyginus,²⁰ or Fulgentius,²¹ all of whom are mentioned by Mr. Macaulay as probable sources.

A more impressive correspondence between Boccaccio and Gower

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II 496 (note on III 973 ff.).

⁹ *De Gen.* II 25, x 50-60.

¹⁰ *Fabulae*, ed. Mauricius Schmidt, Jenae, 1872, cv i, cxvi, and *passim*.

¹¹ *Bibliothekn*, *Loeb Classical Library*, ed. Sir J. G. Frazer, 1921, II i 5, II vii 4, etc.

¹² *Op. cit.*, II 503 (note on IV 731 ff.). ¹³ *Conf.* IV 867. ¹⁴ *De Gen.* XI 25.

¹⁵ Hyginus, *op. cit.*, LIX; Apollodorus, *op. cit.*, vol. II, *Epitoma*, VI xvi; Filippo "Ceffi"'s Italian translation of the *Heroides*, ed. G. Bernardoni, *Epistole Eroiche di Ovidio Nasone*, Milano, 1842. Fulgentius, *Opera*, ed. John Conington, fourth edition, London, 1884; Albricius Philosophus, in *Mythographi Latini*, ed. Thomas Munckerus, Amsterdam, 1681; and the author of the *Ovide Moralisé* do not treat the story.

¹⁶ Servius, *Commentarii in Virgilium Serviani*, ed. H. Albertus Lion, Gottingae, 1826, Vol. II, on *Bucol.* V 10.

¹⁷ *Conf.* V 363 ff.

¹⁸ *Fab.* LXXXII.

¹⁹ *De Gen.* XII 1.

²⁰ *Opera*, II xv.

²¹ *Met.* IV 458 f.

appears in the story of Theseus and Ariadne, of which Mr. Macaulay writes,²² "The outline of this story might have been got from Ovid or from Hyginus, *Fab.* 40-43, but several points of detail suggest a different source . . . [as] the name of the island where Ariadne was deserted." Gower identifies the island as "Chyo,"²³ although Ovid,²⁴ Hyginus,²⁵ and Apollodorus²⁶ maintain it to be the island of Naxos or Dia,²⁷ names upon which the majority of Latin and Greek writers agree. Significantly, in the *De Genealogia Deorum*, we find "in Chium insulam: ut dicit Ovidius,"²⁸ a statement that seems to indicate that the manuscript of Ovid used by Boccaccio had "Chium" substituted for the usual "Naxon" or that Boccaccio misread the manuscript. We are led to believe Boccaccio's handbook or possibly the *Ovide Moralisé* to be the source of Gower's "Chyo."

It is worthy of note that, of the works which might have been Gower's sources for the particulars I have discussed, only the *Genealogia* contains all the parallels. In the light of these parallels, it seems extremely likely that Gower knew Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* and consulted it in the course of the composition of his *Confessio Amantis*. Such a likelihood is doubly significant in that it augments the possibility that Gower's acquaintance, Chaucer, also knew and used Boccaccio's compendium.²⁹

DOROTHY A. DILTS

Cambridge, Mass.

²² *Op. cit.*, III 503 (note to v 5231 ff.).

²³ *Conf.* v 5413.

²⁴ *Met.* XIII 636, 640, 649, 690; VIII 174-6.

²⁵ *Fab.* XXXIII.

²⁶ *Epitoma*, I 9.

²⁷ The *Ovide Moralisé*, Fol. 173^a, has the name "Thie," according to S. B. Meech, *PMLA*, 46, 1931, p. 200. However, de Boer's ed. has the reading "Chie." Albricus Philosophus and Fulgentius do not give the story. Filippo's translation of the *Heroides* does not name the island. Servius, *Georg.* I 222, identifies it as "Naxum insulam."

²⁸ *De Gen.* XI 29.

²⁹ C. G. Child, *MLN.*, 11, 1896, 475-490; W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, III, 1894, xxxiv, xxxix, xl; E. F. Shannon, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets*, Cambridge, 1929, 67, 72, 75, 96, 136, and *passim*; T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, New York, 1892, II 184, 232, 262; J. L. Lowes, *PMLA.*, 33, 1918, 323-4; and H. R. Patch, *MLN.*, 34, 1919, 327, and *On Rereading Chaucer*, 1939, 40. On the other hand see S. B. Meech, *PMLA.*, 46, 1931, 182 ff.

OBSERVATIONS ON DANTE AND THE
HOUS OF FAME

An interesting and heretofore almost unnoticed example of the workings of Chaucer's mind upon suggestions caught from another writer is found at the end of the first book of the *Hous of Fame* and at the beginning of the second, where the description of the eagle and of the dizzy ascent into the heavens runs closely parallel to passages in Dante's *Paradiso*¹ and in his *Purgatorio*.²

As Chaucer wrote that in his dream he turned his eyes to heaven and

faste be the sonne, as hye
As kenne myghte I with myn ye,
Me thoughte I sawgh an egle sore . . .³

his mind seems to have been dwelling upon Beatrice in the *Paradiso*, who is described as looking into the sun:

riguardar nel sole.⁴

There, too, as in Chaucer we find the eagle:

Aquila si non gli s'affisse unquanco.⁵

Chaucer's imagination then turned to the *Purgatorio*,⁶ as Mr. Skeat⁷ points out, and modelled his shining eagle upon the golden eagle that carried Dante aloft. Mr. Skeat notes that Chaucer's description is also somewhat similar to Dante's description of the descent of the angel, in an earlier canto of the same work.⁸ It may be worthy of note, in addition to these observations of Mr. Skeat, that Dante's figure of the herald bearing news after the description of the angel is suggestive of the motif of tidings so important in the *Hous of Fame*.

¹ *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, ed. G. A. Scartazzini, Milan, 1896. Professor H. R. Patch called my attention to the passages in the *Paradiso*, particularly I, 61-3.

² *Ibid.* Chaucer's probable debt to two passages is noted by W. W. Skeat, *Works of Chaucer*, III, 1894, 253 (note to I 500).

³ *Hous of Fame*, in *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Boston and New York, 1933, I, 497-9, p. 336.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, I, 47-8.

⁷ W. W. Skeat, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 17-24.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, IX, 19 ff.

The picture of Beatrice and Dante gazing upon the sun again seems to have dominated Chaucer's mind as he proceeded with his description of the eagle, using Dante's brilliant figure of speech:

never sawe men such a syghte,
But yf the heven had ywonne
Alle newe of gold another sonne . . .⁹

Dante had written (*Paradiso*):

E dī subito parve giorno a giorno
essere aggiunto, come quei che puote
avesse il ciel d'un altro sole adorno.¹⁰

In the succeeding verses, Dante, like Chaucer, is lifted up¹¹ so fast that

ma folgore, fuggendo il proprio sito,
non corse, come tu che ad esso riedi.¹²

Strikingly similar is Chaucer's description of the downward and upward swoop of the eagle:

But never was ther dynt of thonder,
Ne that thing that men calle foudur,
That smot somtyme a tour to powder,
And in his swifte comynge brende,
That so swithe gan descende,
As this foul. . .¹³

Beatrice's explanation of Dante's cosmic flight, in the following stanzas, is in substance identical with the learned discourse of Chaucer's eagle upon the scientific reason for the ascent of sound to the Hous of Fame, as in the verses:

Thus every thing, by thys reson,
Hath his propre mansion,
To which hit seketh to repaire . . .¹⁴

Chaucer's mind was probably directed to this line of reasoning by such verses as these spoken by Beatrice:

⁹ *Op. cit.*, I, 504-6, p. 337.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, I, 61-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 74-5:

"Amor che il ciel governi,
tu il sai, che col tuo lume mi levasti."

¹² *Ibid.*, 92-3.

¹³ *Hous of Fame* 534-9, p. 337.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 753-5, p. 339.

Le cose tutte quante
 hanne ordine tra loro . . .
 Nell' ordine ch' io dico sono accline
 tutte nature, per diverse sorti,
 più al principio loro e men vicine . . .¹⁵

It is impossible to say which detail in the complex web of associations first drew Chaucer's mind to these passages in Dante; but the repeated similarities seem to render undeniable the thesis that Chaucer adopted Dante's ideas and images in the creation of his own fresh and beautifully integrated vision.

DOROTHY ARLENE DILTS

Northampton, Mass.

CHAUCER MENTIONS A BOOK

Commenting upon the *Book of the Duchess* in his edition of Chaucer, Professor Robinson observes:

The regular features of the love-vision, many of which reappear in the *House of Fame*, the *Parliament of Fowls*, and the *Prologue to the Legend of Good Women*—the introductory device of reading a book, the discussion of sleeplessness and dreams, the setting on May-day or in the spring-time, the vision itself, the guide (who in many poems takes the form of a helpful animal), the personified abstractions, Love, Fortune, Nature, and the like—all these are in evidence.¹

The present note is concerned with "the introductory device of reading a book." Among the sources cited by Professor Robinson,² the *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame* by Professor Sypherd offers the only treatment of this detail. Here the following observations occur concerning the *Book of the Duchess*:

The complaint of sleeplessness, the suggested explanation, the device of reading a book, the promise of a reward to Morpheus and Juno if the poet can be made to sleep, the reference to other dreams, the May morning scenery, the motive of the guide, are with slight variations all characteristic elements of the Old French love-visions.³

¹⁵ *Paradiso*, I, 108-111.

¹ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), p. 315.

² Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 881.

³ W. O. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame* (London, 1907), p. 10. Cf. also p. 23.

In the next paragraph Professor Sypherd adds:

I have said before that the device of reading a book is due to the love-visions. Chaucer uses it to induce sleep; Froissart in his *L'Espinette Amoureuse* to develop his love-story.⁴

An examination of the evidence throws some doubt upon these conclusions.

In Froissart's *L'Espinette Amoureuse*, after a lengthy dialogue of nearly six-hundred lines between the poet and Venus, a beautiful maiden appears carrying a book. The poet asks the maiden its name and is informed, "*De Cleomades*." After an extended comment on the maiden's beauty, the poet retires to compose a ballade on love.⁵ Chaucer's mention of a book forms a contrast to *Froissart*. In the *Book of the Duchess*, the poet reads Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to induce sleep, and after summarising the story of Ceyx and Alcione, proceeds to narrate his own dream which constitutes the main body of the poem.⁶ In the *Parliament of Fowls*, the poet tells how he spent the day reading Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* and outlines the story. At nightfall he lays aside the book and has a dream in which Scipio acts as guide.⁷ In both of Chaucer's poems the book specified is read by the poet, its contents summarised, and the incident serves in an introductory capacity to set the mood for the entire poem. None of these details occur in Froissart, where the mention of a book plays a minor and incidental part.

What, then, may be Chaucer's source for the mention of a book? An examination of Old French love-vision literature by the present author has revealed no further examples of such an occurrence (with one exception that will be discussed presently), and it seems reasonable to conclude that the mention of a book was not a conventional device.⁸ The exception is found in the *Roman de la*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. M. A. Scheler, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1870-1872), I, 107 ff.

⁶ *Book of the Duchess*, ll. 44 ff.

⁷ *Parliament of Fowls*, ll. 14 ff.

⁸ I have examined the Old French love-visions listed in Professor Sypherd's bibliography, which total some fifteen poems variously authored by Machault, Deschamps, Froissart, Jean de Conde, Nicole de Margival and Watriquet de Couvin. See Sypherd, *op. cit.*, p. 5n. A further examination of the more extensive group of Old French poems in Dr W. A. Neilson's

Rose. Here, in the opening lines, the poet mentions the *Somnium Scipionis* as authority for the belief that dreams are true, and incorrectly attributes the work to Macrobius.⁹ That Chaucer knew and imitated this passage is evident in the light of his translation of the *Roman de la Rose*¹⁰ and the fact that he incorporated it, with the same mistake in authorship, in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*¹¹ and the *Book of the Duchess* itself.¹² If it is necessary to adduce the ultimate source for Chaucer's highly developed use of the mention of a book, this passage from the *Roman de la Rose* appears preferable to Froissart's *L'Espinette Amoureuse* because of the poet's demonstrable acquaintance with it, its parallel occurrence in the introduction of the poem, and the fact that Chaucer makes use of the identical work in the opening lines of his *Parliament of Fowls*.

In post-Chaucerian literature there are two notable examples of the mention of a book. James I, in his *Kingis Quair*, relates that he read Boethius upon awakening one morning. After praising the author at great length he rises and begins his poem. Later, after describing the first sight of his future wife, he has a vision.¹³ The most sophisticated use of the mention of a book, however, occurs in Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*. Two books are mentioned here.¹⁴ The first is Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* which the poet says he has just read and proceeds to summarise. The summary is largely in Chaucer's own words and furnishes a logical point of departure for Henryson's great sequel. The second is the poem itself which he thus introduces with a literary subtlety rare in medieval literature. It is suggested that his intention was to lend authority to his narration.¹⁵

Origins and Sources of the Court of Love (Boston, 1899), *passim*, also proved fruitless. Twenty odd poems by as many authors (some of them not strictly love-visions, and with a few duplications of Sypherd) are treated by Dr. Neilson. No pertinent mention of a book was discovered in any of the above works.

⁹ *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. E. Langlois, 5 vols., *S. A. T. F.* (Paris, 1914-1924), II, 1 ff.

¹⁰ See Chaucer's *Romaunt of the Rose*, II, 1 ff.

¹¹ See l. 3123.

¹² See l. 284.

¹³ *The Kingis Quair*, ed. A. Lawson (London, 1930), pp. 2-7.

¹⁴ See *Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson*, ed. H. H. Wood (Edinburgh, 1933), pp. 106-107.

¹⁵ For comment on this passage, see W. W. Skeat, ed., *Chaucerian Pieces*

To conclude, it seems probable that the mention of a book in love-vision literature can be correctly called a conventional device only after Chaucer. Chaucer's use of it appears highly original, and although the opening lines of the *Roman de la Rose* may have suggested it to him, he is responsible for its virtual origin and outstanding use as an integral component of the love-vision.

MARSHALL W. STEARNS

Yale University

CHAUCER AND "ARNOLD OF THE NEWE TOUN"

In a communication to the editors of *Modern Language Notes* ("The Dragon and His Brother," *MLN.*, xxvii, 229) Professor John Livingstone Lowes pointed out that the source of ll. 1431-40 of Chaucer's "Canon's Yeoman's Tale" is not, as Chaucer avers, the *Rosarium* of Arnald of Villa Nova, but a lesser known tract of Arnald's, *De Lapide Philosophorum*.

Two additional bits of interesting information are to be adduced from a close reading of these two treatises in connection with the above-mentioned and immediately succeeding lines of Chaucer's *Tale*.

The first is that Chaucer took the thought of the next seven lines following those quoted by Professor Lowes (which Chaucer himself indicates are a continuation of his citation from Arnald) also from *De Lapide Philosophorum*. Chaucer's lines read:

"And, therefore," seyde he,—taak heed to my sawe—
 "Let no man bisye him this art for to seche,
 But if that he th'entencioun and speche
 Of philosophres understand can;
 And if he do, he is a lewed man.
 For this science and this konnyng," quod he,
 "Is of the secree of secrees, pardee."¹

The passages which are the sources of these lines come in chapters one and six of *De Lapide*:

(Oxford, 1897), pp. 521-522; G. G. Smith, ed., *The Poems of Robert Henryson*, 3 vols., *S. T. S.* (Edinburgh, 1906-1914), i, 45; Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

¹ *OT.*, viii, 1441-7 (Students' Cambridge Edition).

Therefore that art is not unless concerning the secrets of the philosophers. None, therefore, may come to this science until they have first heard logic and afterward philosophy and know the causes and natures of things and elements. Otherwise they fatigue their minds and bodies in vain.

The disciple said: What your words are I do not understand. And he: Is it not necessary that I should hide from you this secret of secrets as the philosophers have done, because it has not been told of this science as it has been of others? ²

The other interesting fact is that the *idea* of the passage in *De Lapide* utilized in ll. 1431-40 of the *Tale* is to be found as well in the *Rosarium*, though not couched in such mystifying language. Those lines, it will be remembered, represent Arnald as quoting a dark saying of Hermes to the effect that the dragon may not be slain without his brother. And the lines continue by giving Arnald's explanation: By the dragon is meant mercury, and, by his brother, "brymstoon [sulphur]. . . . That out of Sol and Luna were ydrawe"; mercury may not be "mortified" [i. e. transmuted] without the aid of an esoteric sulphur extracted from silver and/or gold.

Here is the expression of the same idea (an idea which is the center of Arnald's alchemical teaching) ³ in the *Rosarium*:

Who therefore knows to tinct mercury with Sol and Luna comes to the arcane, which is called white Sulphur, best for silver, which when it is made red, will be red sulphur best for gold. From those bodies, therefore, the exceedingly white and red sulphur is extracted, since in them is the purest substance of sulphur. . . . For its father is *Sol*; *Luna* is its mother, for from those bodies with their sulphur . . . is our medicine extracted.⁴

² Arnaldi de Villanova *Opera* (Lugd., 1532) f. 303v: "Ars igitur ista non est nisi de occultis philosophorum. Nulli igitur ab [ad?] ha[n]c scientia[m] veniant nisi primo audiverunt logica[m] & postea ph[ilosoph]iam & sciant causas & naturas rerum atq[ue] elementorum. Aliter frustra fatigaret anima[m] suam & corpus suum." *Ibid.*, f. 304v: "Dixit discipulus que verba sunt non intelligo. Et ille: nonne oportet quod ego occulte[m] tibi hoc secretum secretorum sicut fecerunt ph[ilosoph]i: quod non est de hac scientia sicut de aliis dictum est."

³ Cf. Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III, 58.

⁴ Arnald, *Rosarium* (in J. J. Manget's *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa* (Geneva, 1702), I, 664-665: "Qui ergo argentum vivum cum Sole & Luna

The occasion for Chaucer's citing the title of one of Arnald's treatises while actually borrowing from another may, I believe, be deduced from the evidence. The *Rosarium* (*Rosarie*, as Chaucer calls it) is the longest and best known of Arnald's alchemical treatises.⁵ It would be the one most frequently associated with his name in alchemical circles of the fourteenth century. In this fact is ample reason for Chaucer's wishing to cite it. It did not, however, possess, for Chaucer's purpose in quotation, certain advantages belonging to the shorter and lesser-known *De Lapide*: It did not make use of the mystifying language Chaucer needed to cap the climax of confusion in the bleary-eyed and bleary-brained Yeoman's recital, such mystifying language as he found in a version of the *Tábula Chemica*, attributed to the apocryphal alchemist Senior,⁶ which the Yeoman also quotes. This advantage the *De Lapide* possessed, and it possessed as well another advantage for Chaucer, whose every tale shows his love of high-sounding, authoritative names—it quoted Hermes, the thrice great, the father of all alchemists. At the same time the alchemical idea which Chaucer borrowed from the *De Lapide* was to be found in substance, as Chaucer doubtless knew,⁷ in the *Rosarium*. No one but a purist of the deepest dye could carp at his combining the title of one treatise with a quotation from another in order to get the advantages, for the artistry of his story, of both.

EDGAR HILL DUNCAN

Vanderbilt University

tingere novit, venit ad arcanum, quod dicitur Sulphur album, optimum ad argentum, quod cum rubeum efficitur, erit sulphur rubeum optimum ad aurum. Ab illis igitur corporibus extrahitur sulphur nimium album & rubeum, cum in ipsis sit purissima sulphuris substantia. . . . Pater enim ejus est Sol, Luna mater est; quia ex illis corporibus cum suo sulphure . . . nostra elicitur medicina."

⁵ Thorndike, *op. cit.*, III, 57 ff.

⁶ Cf. J. Ruska, "Chaucer und das Buch Senior," *Anglia*, LXXI, 136-137.

⁷ For additional evidence of Chaucer's wide knowledge of alchemical practice and theory, see my article, "The Yeoman's Canon's Silver Citrinacion," *MP*, XXXVII (February, 1940), 241-262.

"WHEN HE HIS 'PAPIR' SOGHTE," CT A-4404

Chaucer's *Cook's Tale*¹ tells the story of a London victualler's frivolous apprentice named Perkyn Revelour. Perkyn had been inattentive to his duties not only because of disinclination, but also because

"... he were ny out of his prentishood" (l. 4400).

The description of this unsatisfactory state of affairs brings us to the line in question here:

"Upon a day when he his papir soghte" (l. 4404),

which seems to have puzzled the editors.³ Obviously Perkyn, who either had left his master's house or was about to do so (ll. 4399-4400), was seeking to end his apprenticeship before its legal expiration. Actually, by frequenting taverns (l. 4376), he went so far as to give his master legal grounds for breaking the terms of his indenture,⁴ but since these tactics were not producing the desired effect quickly enough, Perkyn then (l. 4404) demanded his 'papir.' Now the 'papir' was just this, namely, an apprentice's indenture (*NED* under 'indenture' sb. 2b. special). What he wanted to do was 'to take up his indenture,' as we should say today. Meanwhile the victualler had been thinking the matter over and, when the apprentice demanded his 'papir' or indenture, the master recalled the proverb of the rotten apple (ll. 4406-07) and applying it to his own household of apprentices, gave Perkyn 'acquittance' (l. 4411) or legal evidence of discharge.⁵

"And thus this joly prentys hadde his leve" (l. 4413).

¹ W. W. Skeat ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1894), II 129; F. N. Robinson ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 73.

² On the origins and history of apprenticeship in England, see O. J. Dunlop and R. D. Denham, *English Apprenticeship and Child Labour*, London, 1912.

³ Robinson, p. 792, apparently following Skeat iv, 130, seems to regard the line as referring to the victualler and his account books.

⁴ Dunlop and Denham, p. 55.

⁵ *NED* under 'acquittance' sb. 3.

⁶ cp. *NED* under 'leave' v. 8; 'to quit the service of a person.'

NED under 'paper' sb. 2, cites l. 4404 as an instance of 'paper' in the very general sense of 'paper bearing writing,' but from the foregoing discussion it is, I think, clear that the present reference belongs under 'paper' sb. 7; 'a document written or printed on paper, as a note, bill, or other legal document' such as, in this context, an apprentice's indenture.

R. BLENNER-HASSETT

Harvard University

SANNAZARO'S *ARCADIA* AND GÁLVEZ DE MONTALVO'S *EL PASTOR DE FÍLIDA*

El Pastor de Fílida by Luis Gálvez de Montalvo was first printed in 1582. In his *Spanish Pastoral Romances*, Rennert suggests that since "Montalvo was known as a poet as early as 1568, it is possible that his pastoral romance was written not long after that date."¹ Rodríguez Marín tends to lend support to this contention in a statement made some years earlier in his *Luis Barahona de Soto*, to the effect that there are allusions in the work which refer to happenings occurring long before 1582.² He cites the fall of the young Prince Charles in 1562 while in pursuit of Doña María de Garcetas, an incident which re-appears in disguise in the sixth part of Montalvo's book. That the work was completed by 1569 derives possible additional support from the fact that the poet Gregorio de Silvestre, who in it bears the rustic name of Silvano, died during that year. Had he been dead at the time of its composition, the incident would presumably have been mentioned.

Menéndez y Pelayo calls the work one of the best written of the Spanish pastoral romances,³ but neither he nor Rennert makes any extended critical analysis of it, nor any attempt to place it in intimate relationship to other productions in the genre.

Here I shall restrict myself to the rôle played by Sannazaro's *Arcadia*.

In the Parte Segunda of *El Pastor de Fílida* we are informed that on the anniversary of the death of Elisa, beloved of Mendino,

¹ Philadelphia, 1912, p. 107.

² Madrid, 1903, p. 117.

³ *Orígenes de la novela*, I, Madrid, 1925, p. cdlxvi.

the man who in real life was don Enrique de Mendoza y Aragón, the Maecenas of Montalvo, there is a general gathering of shepherds at her grave to honor her memory. The old *rabadán*, Alfesibeo, begins by singing an elegy to her. Belisa, Filardo and Alfeo follow with songs that apparently have no connection with the solemn occasion. Sileno now calls for silence and announces prizes for the winners in various sporting events—wrestling, running, jumping and *tirar la barra*. These events are rounded out by several strong-man stunts. Finally, Galafrón sings a second elegy to Elisa and the party breaks up.

Except for a certain amount of juggling of the sequence of the events and the substitution of some details for others given in the source, for example, the prizes offered, this is a faithful reproduction of the scene depicted in Prosa undecima of the *Arcadia*. In the Italian pastoral, on the occasion of the anniversary of Massilia's death, a group of shepherds are on hand at her tomb to pay homage to her. Ergasto, who is replaced by Alfesibeo in the Spanish work, announces that there will be prizes for running, throwing the *barra* and wrestling. A strong-man stunt is also performed. Ergasto, finally, sings an elegy to Massilia.

It may be added that Alfesibeo's elegy starts with a virtual reproduction of Ergasto's plaint:

Pues el suave sentido y dulce canto
perdió la causa en testimonio desto
comenzad, Musas, vuestro amargo canto.

(*Orígenes de la novela*, II, Madrid, 1931, p. 500)

Compare

Poi che 'l soave stile e 'l dolce canto
sperar non lice più per questo bosco;
ricominciate, Muse, il vostro canto.

(*Arcadia*, [ed. Carrara], Torino, 1926, p. 121)

From here on, except for repetitions, with variations, of the refrain (line three), the rest of the composition owes little to its Italian model. But in the course of the athletic contests already described the pastorals come into a more direct contact. The foot-race is already in process and

Fronimo, corrido, criando alas de su afrenta, con dos cuerpos se le puso delante (i.e. of Folco). Uranio iba tras Folco, y Tirseo tras Uranio, cuando Fronimo vanaglorioso de su ventaja, y codicioso de la vitoria, o tropezó en la tierra o en sus piernas, que súbito pareció tendido en la

carrera y Folco sobre él, que no pudo apartarse sin caer. Uranio y Tirseo, se vieron señores del campo, y la grita y ruido de la gente, que les debiera animar, parece que los desalentó, de modo que los dos caídos levantándose, y ellos entropeciéndose todos cuatro llegaron casi juntos a los premios.

(*op. cit.*, p. 505)

How closely Montalvo draws upon Sannazaro for the above details can best be brought out by comparing the imitation with its model.

Ma Carino con maravigliosa leggerezza era già avanti a tutti. appresso il quale, ma di bona pezza, seguiva Logisto, e dopo Ofelia . . . E già vincitore Carino poco avea da correre . . . quando non so come, gli venne fallito un piede, o sterpo o altro che se ne fusse cagione; e senza potere punto aitarsi, cadde subitamente col petto e col volto in terra; il quale, o per invidia non volendo che Logisto la palma guadagnasse, o che da vero, levar si volesse, non so in che modo ne l'alzarsi gli oppose davanti una gamba, e con la furia medesima che colui portava, il fè parimente a sè vicino cadere. Caduto Logisto cominciò Ofelia con maggiore studio a sforzare i passi per lo libero campo, vedendosi essere il primo; a cui il gridare de' pastori e 'l plauso grandissimo aggiungevan animo a la vittoria, tal che . . . ottenne come si desiderava, la prima palma . . .

(*op cit*, p. 113)

In Montalvo Barcino and Pradelio engage in a fierce wrestling-match:

. . . y así, andando en torno gran espacio, sin dar el uno lugar al otro para sus fuerzas ni él ni el otro para sus mañas, ya sus venas estaban tan gruesas que parecían querer reventar, y el sudor de sus frentes les quitaba la vista . . . juntos se tornaron a apercebir y juntos gimieron como dos bravos toros en pelea. Ya la gente estaba admirada de la terrible y peligrosa lucha, y lastimosos los dos pastores, pero ellos mas animosos que al principio, iban buscando sus presas, quando Sileno, puesto en medio, les atajó su porfía . . . Y a Barcino le fué dado el cayado gentil, y a Pradelio el galán arco.

(*op. cit.*, p. 504)

Again, for these details, Montalvo draws heavily upon his source:

Finalmente (ie. Uranio and Selvaggio) l'un verso l'altro approssimatosi, poi che per bono spazio riguardati si ebbero dal capo insino ai piedi, in un impeto furiosamente si ristrinsero con le forti braccia; e ciascuno deliberato di non cedere, parevano a vedere duo rabbiosi orsi o duo forti tori, che in quel campo combattessono. E già per ogni membro ad ambiduo correva il sudore, e le vene de le braccia e de le gambe si mostravano maggiori e rubiconde per molto sangue . . . Ad ultimo alzatasi con malo animo si apparecchiavano a la terza lotta, ma Ergasto, non volle che le ire più avanti procedessero, et amichevolmente chiamatili, gli disse:—Le vostre

forze non son ora da consumarsi per un sì picciolo guidardone eguale è di ambiduo la vittoria, et eguali doni prenderete,—E così dicendo, a l'uno diede il bel vaso, a l'altro una cetera nova . . .

(*op. cit.*, pp. 116-17)

In the first poem of the Sexta Parte of the *Pastor de Filida* Silvano (Silvestre) and Batto engage in a violent debate over the respective merits of their compositions. Siralvo (Montalvo) agrees to act as judge in a responsive singing match if they will sing of Lúcida and Tirrena. Silvano is willing to wager his *lira de ciprés y sándalos* provided Batto will part with his *rabel de pino*. As the latter does not consent to this, Silvano offers two kids and Batto a rich vase. Both invoke inspiration before singing of their lassies, after which two riddles are proposed. The contest is so even that Siralvo proclaims he cannot choose the winner between them.

In Sannazaro's verse of Prosa Nona, Ofelia and Elenco indulge in bitter recriminations over their poetic merits. Elenco would have Ofelia wager a *vacca che sovente muggiola* in return for his *pelle* and duo *cerbiatti mascoli*. They agree, however, on the wager of a lyre on the part of Elenco and two vases on the part of Ofelia. Montano is to judge of their talents. Before singing of Tirrena and Amaranta both contestants invoke inspiration and wind up by proposing riddles. Montano declares them to be of equal ability.

Since Montalvo knew that Sannazaro had followed the pattern of Vergil's third eclogue very closely, it is natural that he should simultaneously use both the Latin and the Italian compositions as his models. The description of Batto's vase is, for example, inspired by a similar description of two beech-wood cups made by Alcimedon in the Vergilian poem, while the invocation by the same shepherd ending: *pues ama el mismo Apolo mis acenlos* coincides with the *Et me Phoebus amat . . .* of Menalcas' invocation in the Latin eclogue. As to traces of Sannazaro here, they are most clearly visible in the *versi sdruccioli*, and in the portraits of the two lassies: *Tirrena mia . . . Lucida mia . . .* which go back to the verse of the Prosa seconda of the Italian work.*

Whereas its Spanish pastoral romance predecessors, the *Diana* of Montemayor and the *Diana Enamorada* of Gil Polo, were only

* See an interesting discussion of this conventionalized type of portrait by María Rosa Lida, "Transmisión y recreación de temas grocolatinos," *Revista de filología hispánica*, 1, 1939, 56-57.

superficially affected by the *Arcadia*, *El Pastor de Filida*, especially by virtue of its extensive borrowing in the *Parte segunda*, established the Italian work as an indispensable model for other books of the type. This was soon to be illustrated in the pastoral romance that immediately followed *El Pastor de Filida*, Cervantes' *Galatea*, of which Scherillo in the introduction to his edition of the *Arcadia*⁵ says: "Per dimostrare . . . quanto numerose esse siano (i.e. the imitations) ci vorrebbe addirittura una ristampa della *Galatea* coi richiami in margine dei passi dell'*Arcadia*."

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Northwestern University

SOME SANDHI PHENOMENA IN MODERN GREEK

*a in Italian Loan-words*¹

Sandhi, which played a definite role in Ancient Greek,² has become fairly characteristic of Modern Greek. The reasons for this lie, as Hatzidakis³ has pointed out, in the quick rhythm of the modern language. When two vowels collide, the weaker one is suppressed, according to a sonority scale: *a* is the strongest vowel. This strength however is not the only reason why *a* has, in Modern Greek sandhi, an especial importance; it is to be added that for *a* the possibilities of standing in sandhi are from the beginning very great. For the majority of initial changes in Modern Greek are attributable to the influence of grammatical elements: the article, the inflectional endings, and the particles, all of which often end in *a*. Hence it follows that the changed word has been changed mainly because it belongs to a certain grammatical category. Therefore I am grouping the material⁴ in grammatical categories, and

⁵ Torino, 1888, p. ccxvi.

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the *Linguistic Society of America*, Providence, December, 1940.

² E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, pp. 395-414.

³ *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 321 ff.

⁴ The material was gathered partly by myself in Greece, partly from the collections of the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek*, by the Academy of Athens now in progress, of which the first two volumes have been published: *Ιστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς*, 'Αθήναι 1933 ff.

giving within each group first the cases of prothesis, then the cases of apheresis, both of which are merely different results of the same linguistic process; and finally, as far as they exist, the cases of initial vowel change.

1. *The masculine noun.* The Greek masculine noun is found in sandhi position mainly in the combination of the accusative with the indefinite article *ένα*.

(a) Prothesis [6 cases]: from the Ital. *germano* "wild duck" is derived the Zantiote *ἀγέριμανος*; from the Ital. *rosmarino* "rosemary" the Cretan *ἀρισμαρίς*.

(b) Apheresis [2 cases]. from the Venetian *ambassador* "ambassador" is found in Kythnos *βασαδόρος* "mining worker who carries metal."

2. *The feminine noun.* With the feminine noun the indefinite article *μιά* has been of great influence.

(a) Prothesis [30 cases]: from the Ital. *furia* "fury" is found in Syme *ἀφούρια*, in Kalymnos *ἀφούρξα*, and the Tsakonian *ἀφούρια*; from the Ital. *giara* "earthen vessel" the Lesbian *ἀτζάρα* "pitcher"; from the east Venetian *magnadora* "manger" we have Mykonos *ἀμανιαδούρα*.

(b) Apheresis [6 cases]: from the Ital. *agliata*, Venetian *agiada* "garlic-sauce" is derived in Crete and Siphnos *λιάδα*; from the Ital. *andana* "line of vessels moored one behind the other along a quay" the Greek nautical term *ντάνα*.

(c) Change of the initial vowel [4 cases]: *i* or *e* to *a*: Venetian *intraida* "revenues" giving Greek *ἐντράδα* and *ἐντράδα* "revenues, landed property" and from these in Chios *ἀντράδα* "landed property"; *o* to *a*: Ital. *ombrella* "umbrella" to Greek *ὀμπρέλα* giving in Megiste *ἀμπρέλλα*; *u* to *a*: Ital. *umidità* "humidity" giving Greek *ὀμυντιτά*, *ὀμουνιτά* whence the Cretan *ἀμουνιτά*, and Western Cretan *ἀμοντιτά*; Ital. *usura* "usury" giving Greek *οὔσουρα* whence the Cephalonian *ἀζούρα* "usury, interest." The change of the initial vowel can well be explained through the influence of a preceding *a*, which suppressed this weaker initial. It is possible, however, that in these cases no phonetic change has occurred, but that at first the original initial vowel was lost in sandhi, and then, after this apheresis, prothesis took place secondarily. This hypothesis presupposes an intermediate stage without initial vowel, and indeed such a stage is to be found in all the mentioned cases: Cretan *ντράδα*, Lesbian *μπρέλλα*, Cephalonian *μουνιτά*, Middle Greek *ζούρα*.⁶

⁵ M. A. Triandaphyllidis, *Die Lehnwörter der mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur*, Strassburg 1909, pp. 19, 136.

⁶ Cf. A. Thumb, *Indogermanische Forschungen* VII (1897), 9. P. Kretschmer, *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten*, Wien 1905, p. 139. *Ἰσορρικὸν Ἀετικόν*, vol. I s. v. *a*.

3. *The neuter noun.* In sandhi neuter nouns are found especially in combination with the plural definite article *τά* and, in lesser degree, with the indefinite article *ένα*.

(a) Prothesis [10 cases]: from the Old Ital. *rimore* "bustle; insurrection" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀρεμούρο* "tumult of a crowd," Laconian *ἀλεμούρο* "robbery" and the derivative *ἀλεμουριάζω* "rob"; from the Aroumanian loan-word *αγγιγίλιε* "violin" we can infer a hypothetical Greek basis **ἀβγιολί*. the Greek word is derived from the Venetian *violin*.

(b) Apheresis [5 cases]: from the Ital. *aiuto* "help" we find in Mykonos *γιούτο* "alleviation, relaxation"; from the Ital. *appalto* "monopoly" derives the Cephalonian *πάρο*.

4. *Adjective and adverb.* From the nature of the adjective it follows that the changes caused by sandhi are based on a combination of all the possibilities which apply to nouns: the change can proceed from masculine or neuter after *ένα*, from neuter after *τά*, from feminine after *μιά*.

(a) Prothesis [2 cases]: from the Ital. *svelto* "agile" we find in Corfu, Crete, Syros, Andros, Astypalaia *ἀσβέλτος* and in Chios the fem. derivative *ἀσβεπροσύνη* "agility."

(b) Apheresis [1 case]: from the Venetian *acupado* "gloomy" is derived Cephalonian *κουπάδος* "dejected; lowly situated."

(c) Change of the initial vowel [3 cases]: *i* to *a*: from the Ital. *innocente* "innocent" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀνοσέντες*.

Adverbs have been influenced especially by the respective adjectives, the first person of the aorist in *-α*, and prepositional phrases. I noted 2 cases of prothesis, 1 of apheresis and 1 of change of the initial vowel.

5. *The verb.* With the verb the particle *νά* from Ancient Greek *ἵνα*, introducing the subjunctive, and the particle *θά* from Ancient Greek *θέλω ἵνα*, introducing the future tense, have been of primary influence.

(a) Prothesis [8 cases]: from the Venetian *refudar* "to refuse" is derived the Cretan *ἀρεφουδέρνω* "forsake," and *ἀρεφουδάρω* "turn out of doors" which latter is used by the Cretan Mussulmans; from the Ital. *varare* "to launch (a ship)" is derived the general nautical term *ἀβαράρω* "move a ship in order to avoid collision."

(b) Apheresis [12 cases]: from the Ital. *allegrare* "to delight" is derived the Thessalian *λγράρω* "be glad" in which the origin of the apheresis becomes evident from the Thessalian idiom *νὰ χαρῶ καὶ νὰ λγράρω* "may I be joyful"; from the Venetian *aidar* "to help" is derived in

Siphnos *διάρω* which was formed via an intermediate metathesis (still alive in Siphnos and Crete) *διάρω*.

(c) Change of the initial vowel [4 cases]: *i* to *a*. from the Ital. *imbarazzarsi* "to interfere" is derived the Cephalonian *ἀμπρατσάρομαι*.

My assumption that the phenomena of prothesis and apheresis are caused by these grammatical elements (*ἐνα, μιά, τά, νί, θά*) is based on the frequency of the latter, but it expresses no more than a tendency. Other combinations also lead to the same result. So, with feminine nouns, a preceding adjective: Thera *ἀλιγαδούρα* "sort of cord" from Venetian *ligadura* "fastening" may derive from a nautical term *ἴσια λιγαδούρα* "flat seizing"; Leucas, Cephalaria *ἀβάλη* "small bay" from Venetian *vale* "fishpound of the lagoon" can be based on an adjectival combination, as shown in the place-name *Βαθειὰ Βάλη* ["deep bay"] on the west coast of Acarnania, opposite Leucas. Or, a preposition may be the determining factor: Syros *ἀνεγότσιο* n. "increase of price" from Venetian *negozio* "trade" may have been formed through an idiom like *γὰ νεγότσιο* "for resale." Certainly, the aorist of verbs, which ends, in the first person, in *-α*, has often played a rôle: the nautical term *τράκος* m. or *τράκο* n. "collision" from Ital. *attracco* may have lost the initial *a-* through idioms like *ἐπαθα τράκο, ἔκαμα τράκο, ἔδωσα τράκο*.

Now, besides these genuine sandhi phenomena there are numerous cases of prothesis and apheresis of *a* which may result from other linguistic tendencies. In these cases, it is difficult to be sure how far these tendencies have worked in connection with the sandhi tendencies and how far they have acted independently. Within the material of loan-words 4 groups of such cases can be distinguished: (1) analogy; (2) popular etymology; (3) phonetic reasons; (4) reasons lying wholly in the Italian. I give some examples.

(1) *Analogy*. If there are found in Chios the verb *ἀμπίρω* and the noun *ἀμίρα*, which derive from Ital. *mirare* "to aim a gun," *mira* "sight (of a gun)," we can not decide whether both words have developed the prothetic vowel without reference to each other, or whether it was transferred from the one to the other. The Bithynian adverb *ἀνέτα* "liberated," certainly derives from the Bithynian adjective *ἀνέτος* which is based on Ital. *netto* "clean, clear, pure"; the *a*-prothesis of this adjective seems, for geographical reasons, to derive from the respective verb: Ital. *nettare* "to clean, to clear" gives, in Ainos (Eastern Thrace), Oyzicus and

Bithynia, ἀνατέρνω, and in Madytos (Eastern Thrace) ἀνετέρνω, probably a popular etymology under the influence of the preposition ἀνά. Ital. *agganciare* "to seize with a hook" gives on the Ionian Islands γαντζάρω, γαντζάρω, in Crete γαντζέρινω; perhaps the initial *a* dropped because the word was felt as a denominative derivation from general-Greek γάντζος m. "hook" which for its part descends from the Venetian-Ital. *ganzo*, *gancio*. The *a* may also be affected by morphologic analogy: Ital. *arresto* appears in Messenia in the idiom τὸν ἔβαλε ρέστο "he arrested him"; here, perhaps the *a* dropped because *arresto* was taken to be an Ital. adverbial formula **a resto*, and because the *a* often dropped in such formulas. Besides these examples of formal analogy, Ital. *petto* "breast" on Greek soil offers an example of semantic analogy which is based on the corresponding Greek στῆθος n. "breast": influenced by the gender of this Greek noun, πέτος in some of the Cyclades becomes neuter; in Crete the analogy goes farther: just as the plural στῆθη (by analogy with the neutra in -ι) became στῆθια and produced the new singular στῆθι, πέτος shows the plural πέτια and the new singular πέτι and μπέτι; and finally, as the last stage of the analogy, just as the plural τὰ στῆθια produced a new singular ἀστῆθι, in Crete μπέτι, through the plural τὰ μπέτια became ἀμπέθια, from which resulted the new singular ἀμπέτι.

(2) *Popular etymology.* Among popular etymologies, the prefix-prepositions play a major rôle: thus we see the influence of ἀνά in Cephalonian ἀναπολιτάνα "trick in game of cards," from Ital. *napoletana*; the influence of ἀντί in Laconian ἀντιβινιαριστικά adv. "approximately": the adverb belongs to the adjective *ἀντιβινιαριστικός which is a deverbal derivative of *ἀντιβινιάρω from Old Ital. *indivinare* "to guess"; we see the influence of ἀπό in Aegium ἀπαγάδα from Venetian **ragada* "calm"; and the influence of διά in the nautical term διαρίζω "mould" which derives, through Greek βιάρω, from Ital. *avviare*. Popular etymologies are numerous; for example: Ital. *lunario* "almanac, calendar" appears in Zante as ἀλωνάριο which is influenced by Greek ἀλωνάρις "July"; Friul. *pládene* "large dish for cakes" is widely spread in Greece as ἀπλάδενα, ἀπλαδένα, ἀπλαδένι "dish tray," whose *a*- can be explained through influence of Greek ἀπλάδα "large, flat dish."

(3) *Phonetic reasons.* It is possible that initial *a*- has at times been produced by assimilatory processes: Venetian. *inganar* "to

deceive" is found as ἀγκανάρω in the Ionian Islands, Crete, the Cyclades, the Dodecanese, and Macedonia. It is possible that at times the accent has been of influence: in Ithaca, from the (metathetical) aorist ἀκροτξερίστηκα which belongs to Ital. *accorgersi* "to notice," a new present κροτξερίζομαι was formed; in this new formation the initial syllable was still more removed from the accented syllable, and by this the dropping of the α- was facilitated.

(4) *Reasons lying wholly in the Italian.* Finally, the α arose or disappeared for reasons which lay not in the receiving, but in the giving language, and so exemplify linguistic mixture. If Venetian *réfelo* "blast of wind" in the Cyclades appears with α-prothesis (as ἀρέφουλας and ἀρεφουλιά), this fact may be explained by the Ital. idiom *a réfoli* "with sudden squalls" which was adopted by the Greeks as a whole. If the word *pagai* of the Venetian idiom *esser paga pagai* "to be square with somebody" appears as ἀπαγαί or ἀπαγάδι in the Ionian Islands, Crete, and Morea, the α-prothesis may be explained by the possibility that the final -a of *pala* in the Ital. idiom was connected by the Greek ear with *pagai*. On the other hand, verbs like ἀρεφονδάρω < Venetian *refundur* may be based on Italian (Venetian) couples like *arecomandur-recomandar, arecordar-recordar*.

In conclusion we can state the following facts: among the 97 cases in which are to be found changes through sandhi concerning α among Italian loan-words in Greek, there are 58 cases of prothesis, 27 cases of apheresis, and 12 cases of vowel change. Therefore, prothesis is the most frequent phenomenon. Apheresis appears mainly with verbs. Among the 97 cases, 40 pertain to the feminine noun, 24 to the verb, 15 to the neuter noun, 8 to the masculine noun, 6 to the adjective, 4 to the adverb. This means that the combination with μᾶ was the strongest, next follows that with ρά and θά, then that with ρά, and finally that with ἔνα which has produced only a few changes. It seems to me that the main reason for this phenomenon lies in the strength of the vowel. The adjective, although exposed because of its three genders to many more possibilities of sandhi position, appears to be less strongly linked than the noun with the preceding word. I was not able to establish a relation between sandhi changes and certain definite sounds; at most I found that prothesis occurred mainly before ρ, which already had played a rôle in the prothesis of Ancient Greek.⁷ A chronology of

⁷ E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, pp. 411-412.

the process is hardly possible, since the great mass of the material belongs to the dialects and has therefore been recorded neither in literary monuments nor in documents, the earliest proofs are: of *a*-prothesis ἀμάρπα "a game" from Ital. *barra* "cross-bar" in the Chronicle of Morea (14th c.);⁸ and of *a*-apheresis κοσταπίζω "approach" from Ital. *accostarsi* in a work of the Rhodian Emmanuel Georgillas (15th c.).⁹ In the 16th and 17th centuries quotations are more copious. The geographical distribution of sandhi-changes certainly depends on the geographical distribution of the Italian loan-words: so my examples are to be found above all in the Ionian and Aegean Islands, in Crete, Cyprus, and Morea. The words in common use belong to the nautical terminology. I believe that the numerous Italian loan-words in Modern Greek offer good material for presenting the tendencies and possibilities of Modern Greek sandhi. To be sure, they can serve only as examples of phenomena which already have been observed; but, as a cultural complex within the Greek, they show these phenomena with especial clearness. They prove the continuity of the linguistic process of sandhi, and the strong assimilatory power of the Greek language.

RENÉE TOOLE KAHANE

Urbana, Illinois

SOME NASHE MARGINALIA CONCERNING MARLOWE

The copy of John Leland's *Principum Ac illustrium aliquot & eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia*¹ in the Harmsworth collection at the Folger Shakespeare Library contains several holo-

⁸ Ed. John Schmitt, London 1904, pp. 352, 600.

⁹ Ed. G. Wagner, *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*, Lipsiae 1874, p. 38, v 208; p. 39, v. 222. Of course, sandhi phenomena are older in Greek than our loan-word material shows and Romance loan-words from Greek bear witness to forms like τάρπαρα (< τὰ ἄρπαρα) → τὰ *ἄρπαρα (REW 6097, 6096 and Schuchardt, *ZRPh* xv, 91, note 2).

¹ With subtitle, *Quibus adiuncta sunt aliquot heroum hodie viuentium a T. Newtono exarata*, Londini, ap. T. Orwinum, 1589. Leland's poems, edited by Newton, are given on the first 112 pages. Page 113 is a new title page reading *Illustrium aliquot Anglorum Encomia*, A Thoma Newtono, Londini, ap. T. Orwinum, 1589. Newton's own Latin poems occupy the remaining 19 pages.

graphic items, hitherto unpublished, which are of interest to students of Nashe and Marlowe. On the back of the title page is Nashe's signature; and in his handwriting on the margins of pages 130 and 132 are quotations from Marlowe's *Faustus*.²

The signature, if authentic, is of special importance because only two other signatures by Nashe seem to be known.³ It is, moreover, the latest of the three, the others dating from 1584 and 1585. Of its authenticity we may, I think, feel reasonably confident. It is marked by the same beautiful and precise penmanship which distinguishes Nashe's subscription to the Latin verses upon *Ecclesiasticus* 41:1. Particularly close similarities between the two occur in the final "e" and the initial "N" of "Nashe," and in the "omas" of "Thomas."

Nashe's quotations from *Faustus* are written on the two final leaves of Leland's book. The first, entered lengthwise in the left margin on page 130, clearly reads: "Faustus:⁴ Che sara sara deuinyntie adieu," and is an unmistakable excerpt from *Faustus'* opening soliloquy:

What doctrine call you this, Che sera, sera.
What will be, shall be? Divinity adieu! (I, i, 48-9.)

In a similar position on the left margin of page 132, the words "divinity adieu" seem to be repeated; but I cannot be sure of the exact spelling of "divinity." There is an undue number of minim strokes after the "t."⁵ On the same page is a further

² For suggestions in the identification and deciphering of the writing I am indebted to Miss Jeanne Rose and Dr. James G. McManaway of the Folger Library.

³ See W. W. Greg, *English Literary Autographs 1550-1650* (London, 1932), I, Plate xx. I have been unable to find references to any others in McKerrow or elsewhere.

⁴ The mark resembling a "g" after the "t" in both writings of "Faustus" is a frequent Elizabethan abbreviation for terminal "us." See S. A. Tannenbaum, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance* (New York, 1930), p. 127.

⁵ Is Nashe punning on the word "ninny" in his two spellings of "divinity"? In the first spelling there is a suggestive extra syllable, "deuinyntie"; and the second spelling may be "deuiyntinie." Compare Greene's pun, "Niniuersitie" for "University" in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (ed. Collins), II, iv, 874. Mischievous word-play of this sort is, of course, highly characteristic of Nashe.

quotation, considerably blurred: "Faustus: studie in indian silke."⁶
The reference apparently is to the passage in Faustus' second



(1) Signature, generally accepted as Nashe's, appended to Latin verses upon *Ecclesiasticus* 41: 1, written as a school exercise at Cambridge. Reproduced here from Greg, *loc. cit.*, as a standard of comparison.

(2) Signature on the back of the title page of the Folger copy of John Leland's *Principum Ac illustrium aliquot & eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia*.

(3) and (4) Marginalia on pp. 130 and 132 respectively of the the same book.

soliloquy, some 40 lines after the first quotation, in which Faustus proposes to have his servant demons

⁶ To the left of this jotting, and very badly smudged, is the signature of Patricke Smith, probably a later owner of the book. I cannot identify him. Immediately to the right of the word "studie" are the letters "Ja," which seem to be by a third hand, the hand of James Choudemby (or perhaps Chonlemly—the name is very hard to decipher), whose signature is scrawled lengthwise in the left margin of page 112. Presumably he was still another owner of the book. On the title page itself are two further broken phrases in Nashe's hand: "printed bookes in these" and "things thought uppon," the latter followed by a very faint writing of the word "Faustus." The significance and connection of these phrases with the play escape me.

fill the public schools with silk

Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad (I, 1, 91-2).

A few lines earlier Faustus has also thought of making his spirits "fly to India for gold" (I, 1, 83). Unlike the "divinity adieu" quotation, this one is not exact, and seems rather to be the jotting down of an idea derived from the play than an attempt to recapture the identical words. Since *Faustus* was not published until after Nashe's death, Nashe is probably remembering what struck him when he saw the play performed.

The question must be asked whether the two quotations from *Faustus* are certainly in Nashe's hand. In my judgment they are. The resemblance between them and Nashe's subscription to the verses on *Ecclesiasticus* is closest in the two writings of the word "Faustus," where the hand is less cursive than it is in the later portions of the quotations. The capital "F's" of "Faustus" should be compared with that of "Fundatrice," and the medial "t's" with those of "illustrissima," "Margareta," and "Fundatrice." Quite noteworthy also is the fact that under the second "divinity adieu" is drawn a horizontal line crossed with two somewhat curved vertical pen marks, serving as a concluding flourish. This is exactly the same as the flourish underlining the Nashe signature on the back of the title page of Leland's book. If that is a genuine signature, then the second "divinity adieu" is likewise genuinely by Nashe; and if the second is, surely the first, of which it is merely an echo, also is. In this way, as well as in the other ways already indicated, all three marginal entries in the Leland are closely bound together.

One would give a good deal to know why and when Nashe wrote these *Faustus* quotations. Nothing in the text of the pages on which they appear seems extremely likely to have brought them into his mind. However, there is one brief poem on page 130 which may possibly have suggested "divinity adieu." It is addressed by Thomas Newton "Ad reuerendū D. Alexandrum Nouellum, verē theologum . . .," and wishes him long life "Ut populum doceas coelēstis pabula vitae." The utter contrast between Nowell and Faustus may be working in Nashe's satirical intelligence. If not, the true cause seems unascertainable.

With regard to the date of the signature and the marginalia, we can take at least one step forward. In his Preface to Greene's

Menaphon, written in 1589,⁷ Nashe deplores the small number of contemporary Englishmen who write good Latin verse: "Thomas Newton with his Leiland, and Gabriell Haruey, with two or three other, is almost all the store that is left us at this houre."⁸ Beyond all doubt, by "Thomas Newton with his Leiland" Nashe means the edition of Leland's poems to which the Folger copy belongs. This work was published in a single edition, in 1589, and contained original Latin poems by Newton as well as Leland's poems edited by Newton.⁹ But whether Nashe owned this particular copy of the book in 1589 is, of course, a somewhat different question. Nevertheless, all the probabilities are in favor of it. A man who has read in 1589 a book published in 1589 and who can be shown to have owned a copy of that book, may be presumed under ordinary circumstances to have owned the copy in 1589, and to have signed his name in it at the time he got it.

More speculative, but still probable, is the further conclusion that Nashe also wrote the marginalia in 1589. He never again mentioned the book in his writings. It was not a popular work, nor, as far as I can see, one that he would be likely to reread from time to time. Unless evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, we may stand upon the natural presumption that the signature and the marginalia are approximately coetaneous. Those who support a date of 1592 for *Faustus* will have to take this presumption into account. It is by no means conclusive, of course; but it has distinct value in favor of a date of 1589, or earlier, for Marlowe's play.

Apart from questions of date, the marginalia offer significant testimony of Nashe's interest in the dramatic work of the man whose *Dido* he was later to revise for publication. The spectacular nature of the quotations chosen is likewise significant. Nashe was obviously fascinated by *Faustus*' daring rejection of religion, and twice penned the blasphemous words. The idea of students wearing silk to their classes had for him an exotic appeal of a not very different kind. Facts like these must have a bearing on our conception of Nashe's character.

PAUL H. KOCHER

The Folger Shakespeare Library

⁷ Entered in the Stationers' Register on August 23, 1589. There is no entry for Leland's *Principum Encomia*.

⁸ Ed. McKerrow, III, 320.

⁹ See n. 1, above.

THE EXCHANGE OF WEAPONS IN *HAMLET*

Mr. Gay's criticism¹ of Mr. J. Dover Wilson's treatment² of the bout in *Hamlet* fails to include the most important criticism of all—the impossibility of effecting the exchange of weapons by Mr. Wilson's method. Mr. Gay dwells on a less important mistake, the incongruous use of armor, which Mr. Wilson retains in his revised edition.³ To diverge for a moment, another minor mistake is overlooked by Mr. Gay; Mr. Wilson believes that in the third bout, scored "Nothing neither way," "the point of Laertes' weapon . . . becomes jammed in the projecting hooks on the hilt of his [Hamlet's] dagger."⁴ Such a jam is impossible with the plain cross-barred daggers the Elizabethans used for duelling, although locks seem to have occurred occasionally in the *pas d'ânes* and side-rings of the *rapier* hilt. However, the deliberate causing of any lock on the stage would have been extremely difficult and quite unnecessary. Osric's unsolicited "Nothing neither way" does not need to end a bout, for not only are we not certain of the status of Elizabethan officials (if there were any) but also the bout may simply have been stopped by the fencers after a sequence of hard action, at which Osric notes the obvious, that there were no hits either way.

Mr. Wilson's exchange of weapons is provoked after Laertes makes a treacherous thrust into Hamlet's arm, when his

bleeding (made visible to the audience) shows him that Laertes holds a sharp, and he determines to get possession of it. Accordingly, he closes with him, beats aside his dagger with the dagger in his own left hand, and suddenly dropping to the ground the foil in his right, seizes with the empty hand the hilt of the sword he covets and wrests it from the enemy's grasp . . . he pauses in ironical courtesy to allow Laertes to pick up the discarded foil.⁵

It is unnecessary to beat the daggers together if they are bated; they have no value in the bout which has suddenly become a real

¹ A. A. Gay, "The Fencing Match in *Hamlet*," *RES.*, xiii (1937), 326.

² J. Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, 2nd ed. (London, 1937), pp. 276 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

⁵ *What Happens in Hamlet*, p. 285. Mr. Wilson notes that this exchange was suggested to him by Mr. Evan John in an article in *TLS.*, January 25, 1935.

duel with only one effective weapon.⁶ It is impossible to wrest a rapier from an opponent's right with the right hand; experiment with the weapons has shown that there is insufficient leverage to overcome the contemporary grip of the first or first and second fingers over the rapier quillon. This right-hand disarm is not mentioned in the Elizabethan fencing manuals, and is after all a disarm and not an exchange. And there is also the important difficulty that Hamlet may spit himself on Laertes' sharp weapon if he drops his own. Wilson has not considered how Hamlet is to get past the point to get to close quarters, and repeated attempts to disarm by right-hand seizure on the fencing floor have convinced me that no rapierman would risk his life so rashly.

Many methods have been used and suggested to effect the exchange of weapons: beating, binding, hard parrying, and Mr. Wilson's right-hand seizure. But all of these methods have the same three faults: they are disarms only and not true exchanges of weapons, they are not mentioned in the contemporary fencing manuals,⁷ and none of them can actually break the strong grip of one or two gloved fingers over the quillon without the connivance of the actor of Laertes. Even if Hamlet did by some beating method succeed in knocking Laertes' weapon to the floor there would be nothing to prevent the frightened Laertes from retrieving it before Hamlet could discard his own weapon and snatch it up. This beating is the traditional stage method, and was used by Mr. Maurice Evans with ludicrous effect.

But there is one disarm, already mentioned by three scholars, which does provoke an exchange, which is included in three important Elizabethan fencing manuals, and with which a skilled fencer can invariably break the grip of gloved fingers away from the rapier quillon. It is probable that enough is now known of the subject to show that the exchange Shakspeare intended in *Hamlet* and three other plays⁸ was that of left-hand seizure. This provokes a counter seizure and exchange instead of a disarmament

⁶ An excellent argument for the daggers being bated lies in the fact that Hamlet forces an exchange; if the daggers were unbated he would not have dared to come to close quarters to make a seizure. Dagger thrusts cannot be parried.

⁷ With the single exception of one mention of the di Grassi disarm.

⁸ *Twelfth Night*, IV, i, 29; *Antony and Cleopatra*, V, ii, 47; *Cymbeline*, V, ii, 5.

only. There are six separate mentions of left-hand seizure in the rapier manuals of Saviolo and di Grassi, and there is an entire chapter on the "grype," as it was called, in Silver's *Bref Instructions Upon My Paradoxes of Defense*.⁹ Di Grassi describes how the rapierman may

take holdfast of the enemies sword, nere the hiltes thereof, yea though his hand were naked, and under his own sworde presently turning his hand outwards, which of force wresteth the sword out of the enemies hand.¹⁰

and experiments with the weapons have shown that the defender cannot successfully resist the outward twist of the attacker's left hand. Silver, in his excellent treatise on swordplay, gives the defense of counter-seizure for the attempted left-hand seizure:

but yf he will cloze with you, then you may take the grype of him safely at his comynge in, for he that by strong pressing in adventureth the cloze loseth it.¹¹

And though Silver's instructional manual was apparently unpublished in his day, the fact that it was prepared for publication indicates that the matter contained is substantially what Silver taught.

These quotations indicate, I believe, that the only method of effecting the exchange which the Shakspearean company would have been at all likely to use was left-hand seizure. Burbadge, the actor of Hamlet, was to receive the treacherous thrust, and then, as though suddenly aware of the chicanery, force the actor of Laertes to an exchange. At single rapier or rapier-and-glove Burbadge would find and lift the "sharp" point with his own, and pass in to "take holdfast" of Laertes' quillon with his left hand. When the actor of Laertes realizes that his hilts are held and he cannot resist being disarmed, his instinctive, and academic, reply is to take the "gryp" of Hamlet's hilts to disarm him. Even if Laertes is aware that Hamlet's blunt weapon will be only of limited use in defending himself against the sharp, it is better than nothing, and Laertes knows Hamlet's murderous intentions from the fact that he is forcing an exchange. Hamlet twists outward and

⁹ *The Works of George Silver*, ed. Cyril Matthey (London, 1898), cap. 4.

¹⁰ *True Arte* (London, 1594), sig. Aa3.

¹¹ *Bref Instructions*, Cap. 4, section 24, "The manner of certain grypes and clozes to be used at the single short sword fight &."

Laertes is disarmed; Laertes also twists, and both step back to pass the exchanged weapons from their left to their right hands.

This is in keeping with the direction of Quarto 1, "They catch one another's rapiers"; it provokes an exchange and not merely a disarmament; and it is a test of skill and determination that the fencing-minded Elizabethans could enjoy thoroughly. At rapier-and-dagger the exchange is substantially the same, although obviously Hamlet must be rid of his dagger before he can make a seizure. This can be done before forcing the "cloze," or, more effectively, the dagger can be used to hold the dangerous blade aside while the Hamlet actor passes inside the length of the blade. The dagger can then be dropped and the seizure taken, and Laertes can drop his dagger to make his counter-seizure. The actor of Hamlet could also take di Grassi's hint and "sling the dagger in deed at the enemies face."¹²

Aside from the disarm and exchange in *Hamlet*, Shakspeare has two other uses of disarming, and one mention of it. A soldier snatches a dagger from Cleopatra when she is about to kill herself;¹³ and Posthumus vanquishes and disarms Jachimo in *Cymbeline*,¹⁴ probably at sword and buckler. It is interesting to note that both Hamlet and Posthumus were probably played by the same actor, Burbadge.¹⁵ And in *Twelfth Night* Sir Toby orders "Hold, sir! or I'll throw your dagger o'er the house."¹⁶

From the discussion that follows, it is clear that seizure is intended. The fact that Shakspeare used the disarmament three times indicates that he had some method of disarming in mind, and this is most apt to have been the common contemporary one of left-hand seizure.

Aside from the six mentions of seizure in the rapier manuals and Silver's chapter and frequent mentions, the only other description of a disarm in Elizabethan fencing manuals is the lone passage in di Grassi (sig. Bb) on an almost impossible disarm by beating with both the attacking blade and the dagger. This might effect a disarm but not an exchange; it is in addition to di Grassi's two mentions of seizure; and it is impossible at rapier-and-glove, which

¹² *True Arte*, sig. Bb. ¹³ *Antony and Cleopatra*, v, ii, 47. ¹⁴ v, ii, 5.

¹⁵ T. W. Baldwin, *Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, pp. 237, 238.

¹⁶ iv, i, 29.

is required in Folio 1.¹⁷ Experiment with this disarm has convinced me that it will practically never break the grip of gloved fingers. We may safely conclude that the very natural disarm and exchange by left-hand seizure was almost the only disarm known to the Elizabethans and consequently the one most apt to appear on their stages.

It is evident that seizure was known and practiced all during the seventeenth century, and even the more polite smallsword techniques of the eighteenth century often included it for self-defense. Thus the treatise of Labat (Paris, 1698) gives illustrations¹⁸ for the use of the left hand in disarming the opponent and in preparing a deliberate riposte; and the fine English text of Angelo (London, 1763) illustrates¹⁹ the disarm of left-hand seizure as taken from four parry positions. There is even a tendency for the instinctive use of the left hand to appear in hard modern fencing, and there is a clause in the American rules to prohibit it.²⁰

Several opinions support the use of left-hand seizure to effect the exchange in *Hamlet*. An unsigned article in the *Saturday Review* in 1886²¹ written more in the measured style of Edgerton Castle than the vivacious style of Alfred Hutton, described the exchange by seizure as illustrated in Sainct Didier's *Traicté* (Paris, 1573).²² The author quotes Sainct Didier's terse description of the use of seizure to meet seizure: *à prise faut faire contreprise*. Also, the short historical sketch preceding the instructional matter of a Victorian fencing manual²³ suggests the use of the left hand as the solution to the exchange in *Hamlet*. Mr. Lee Mitchell had also suggested²⁴ the use of the left hand, I have discovered, but he gives Laertes the impossible reply of right-hand seizure. Miss

¹⁷ This was advanced by Wilson in his Introduction to *Hamlet*.

¹⁸ Reproduced in Edgerton Castle's *Schools and Masters of Fence* (London, 1896), pp. 222, 223.

¹⁹ Reproduced as plates 49-54 in Alfred Hutton's *Old Sword Play* (London, 1892).

²⁰ *Fencing Rules*, Amateur Fencers' League of America (New York, 1889), p. 14.

²¹ LXVII, 479-481.

²² Reproduced in Castle's *Schools and Masters of Fence*, pp. 84, 85.

²³ W. H. Pollock, F. C. Grove and Camille Prevost, "Fencing," *Badminton Library* (London, 1889), p. 17.

²⁴ "Fencing Scene in *Hamlet*," *PQ.*, xvi, 71-75.

Selma Guttman mentions²⁵ the exchange by seizure but she, like Mr. Mitchell, does not give any evidence of contemporary use; her thesis that the weapons in all the productions of *Hamlet* by Lord Strange's men were "single rapier" is not supported by the exchange of left-hand seizure, for, as described, it can also be instigated from rapier-and-dagger. Sir Edmund Chambers has listed²⁶ seizure as one of three ways to effect the exchange, but he inexplicably gives the instigation of the exchange to Laertes, the last person apt to do so. To conclude, the fact that left-hand seizure was the only workable disarm known to the Elizabethans, together with the supporting opinions of two fencers and three scholars, indicates that left-hand seizure was the method intended by Shakspeare in *Cymbeline*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Hamlet*.

JAMES L. JACKSON

The University of Illinois

THE PREMIÈRE OF *THE MOURNING BRIDE*

The date of the first performance of *The Mourning Bride* has not been completely determined. From John Downes' *Roscius Anglicanus* we know that Congreve's tragedy was acted "Uninterrupted 13 Days together," and from a letter dated March 16, 1696/7, it is clear that the play ended its initial run on the preceding Saturday, March 13. On the basis of these two facts D. Crane Taylor has stated¹ that the play was first staged on Saturday, February 28, presumably a misprint, for Saturday was the twenty-seventh. More recently, Professor John Hodges has left the date in doubt by stating that the play had its première on Saturday, February 27, "unless the Lenten season closed the theatres on Wednesdays and Fridays, in which case the première must have been a week earlier."² It is the intent of this note to argue that the first performance more probably than not was on Saturday, February 20, 1696/7.

²⁵ "The Fencing Bout in *Hamlet*," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, xiv, 86-100.

²⁶ *Hamlet*, ed. E. K. Chambers (Boston, 1904), p. 186.

¹ *William Congreve* (London, 1931), p. 98.

² *William Congreve, the Man* (New York, 1941), p. 59 n.

As a means of establishing this point, it is necessary to ascertain theatrical custom in Congreve's day in regard to acting during Lent. Restoration practice in respect to Lenten acting was influenced by that in pre-Restoration years. In Elizabethan times it apparently varied a good deal, for sometimes there was a prohibition of any acting during Lent and in other years performances were banned only on Lenten Wednesdays and Fridays. During the reign of James I the legal authorities were usually strict in forbidding acting on those days.³ After the Restoration the general rule apparently was that the theaters were closed on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent and during the entire week preceding Easter. An examination of Pepys' *Diary* reveals that this practice was fairly closely followed in the years he attended the theatres. On three occasions when a play was offered on a Wednesday or Friday in Lent, Pepys takes special notice of these deviations from the customary practice. On Thursday, March 21, 1667, he went to the Duke of York's playhouse,

where unexpectedly I came to see only the young men and women of the house act; they having liberty to act for their own profit on Wednesdays and Fridays this Lent: and the play they did yesterday, being Wednesday, was so well-taken, that they thought it fit to venture it publicly today.⁴

In 1669 he referred to performances on Wednesday, March 3, and Wednesday, March 17, both in Lent; on each occasion he made specific reference to the fact that the plays were being acted "only by the young people."⁵ At the end of the seventeenth century the custom seems to be well established. From 1696 to 1701 Lady Morley attended plays very frequently, but she did not record

³ The principal discussion of this tradition appears in W. J. Lawrence's "The Origins of the Substantive Theatre Masque," *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 326-34.

⁴ *Diary*, ed. Wheatley, vi, 219.

⁵ *Ibid.*, viii, 228, 248. On the other hand, Pepys appears in other years to have seen plays on occasional Wednesdays and Fridays in the first week of Lent. In 1661 February 27 was Ash Wednesday, yet he attended a performance on Friday, March 1; in 1668, when February 5 was Ash Wednesday, he attended a play on Friday the seventh, but not on a Wednesday or Friday thereafter in Lent. In 1669 also, when February 24 was Ash Wednesday, he saw a play on Friday the twenty-sixth. Even if the custom of having performances in the first week of Lent were being followed in 1697, it would not affect the argument of this paper.

attendance on a Wednesday or Friday during Lent.⁶ For the season of 1703-04, when theatrical advertisements first appeared in the *Daily Courant* with sufficient regularity to offer satisfactory evidence of theatrical customs, there were no performances advertised for Wednesday or Friday in Lent or for the full week before Easter; in fact, the practice was rigidly observed in the patent houses until near the middle of the nineteenth century.

Since it seems very likely that this custom prevailed in the later years of the seventeenth century, what would be its effect upon the first run of *The Mourning Bride*? In 1696/7 Ash Wednesday was February 17 and Easter was April 4. Since it is known that the run of the tragedy ended on March 13, it would appear that, omitting Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays during the preceding two weeks, the play must have been first acted on Saturday, February 20, with successive performances on February 22, 23, 25, 27, March 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13. Downes's statement that it was acted "Uninterrupted" for thirteen nights is no barrier to this interpretation, since he undoubtedly referred to the customary acting nights and clearly meant that no other play interrupted the run. There seems no adequate reason, therefore, for believing that there would be any deviation from normal practice for the opening run of *The Mourning Bride*.

EMMETT L. AVERY

The State College of Washington

COKAIN'S *THE OBSTINATE LADY* AND *THE ARAUCANA*

Sir Aston Cokain's *The Obstinate Lady* is, as Alfred Harbage declared, "of native inspiration,"¹ but in the process of adapting Massinger's *A Very Woman* Cokain made a curious borrowing. In Massinger's play Antonio disguises himself as a blackamoor slave in order to woo his stubborn lady. In Cokain's, Carionil tricks himself out as an Ethiopian prince. As such he might have

⁶ The list of performances appears in Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 377-79.

¹ *Cavalier Drama* (New York, 1936), p. 133.

indulged in the dramatic convention of talking gibberish supposed to be comical. Instead he reflects Cokain's taste by boasting a knowledge of Spanish, which, he says, will further his cause with Polidacre, his prospective father-in-law. He proves his knowledge by speaking two lines of Spanish which seem to be original with him,² then gives further proof by citing, apropos nothing in the neighborhood, a stanza of Spanish which is labeled *Acaucana* (which Maidment and Logan correct to *Araucana*):

Y pues en todos triempos, y ocasiones
 Por la causa comun sin cargo alguno,
 En battalas formadas, y esquadrones
 Puede usar delas armas cada uno.
 Por las mismas ligitimas razones
 E's lcito combate de uno a uno,
 A pie, a cavallo, armado, disarmado
 Ora sea campo abierto, ora estocado.³

The stanza does occur in Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga's oratorical epic of the struggle for Chile: *La Araucana*, Part III, Canto xxxvii, Stanza 8.⁴ Polidacre rises to the Spanish bait to ask, "*Habla, voste, yngles?*" Since the answer is "Yes, sir! I learned your language in Bruxels," the dialogue proceeds with only one more Spanish debt, again to the *Araucana*. When asked his name, the pseudo-Ethiopian Carionil replies, "'Tis Tucapelo," plainly adapting the name of Tucapel, one of the great warriors of the Arauco Indians.

ERNST G. MATHEWS

The University of Illinois

² James Maidment and W. H. Logan, *The Dramatic Works of Sir Aston Cokain* (Edinburgh, 1874), p. 68:

"Estoy yo, como deve, muy lobrego;
 Porque de mi, Lucora haze un negro."

Incidentally, several among the scrambled geographical allusions in the play are to Spain and Spanish America. There is one literary allusion (p. 61)—to Rosinante and Sancho's ass.

³ *The Obstinate Lady* (1658), III, iii. Maidment and Logan (p. 68) made the following changes: *tiempos* for *triempos*, *causo* for *causa*, *comun* for *comun*, *legitimas* for *ligitimas*, *Es* for *E's*, *el* added in l. 6, comma added at end of l. 7, *se a* for *sea*, *abierto* for *abierto*.

⁴ Edición hecha por la Universidad de Chile (Santiago, 1932), II, 395.

KAULBACH'S ILLUSTRATED EDITION OF GOETHE'S
REINEKE FUCHS, 1846

Under numbers 1739 and 1740 the catalogue of the Speck Collection of Goetheana at Yale University¹ lists two copies of this work, the sole difference noted being in the imprint. *München, Literarisch-artistische Anstalt* (No. 1740) and *Stuttgart und Tübingen, J. G. Cotta* (No. 1739). Aside from this difference in the imprint the two copies are described as being one and the same work.

In my first copy the title runs as follows: *Reineke Fuchs von Wolfgang von Goethe mit Zeichnungen von Wilhelm von Kaulbach gestochen von R. Rahn und A. Schleich. München. Verlag der Literarisch-artistischen Anstalt. 1846*. The second copy has the imprint: *Stuttgart und Tübingen. J. G. Cotta'scher Verlag. 1846*. Even a cursory examination reveals that we have here two entirely different printings, which can be distinguished off-hand in the canto-headings *Erster [-Zwölfter] Gesang*, which, in the Munich edition, are set in hollow, open letters, of the same font as *Wilhelm von Kaulbach* on the title-page of both copies; in the Stuttgart edition these headings are in heavy, black-face letters of the same size. Also textually there are numerous and striking differences, of which only a few can here be noted:

I, 181 zu großem Erstaunen M, zum großen Erstaunen S. I, 275 Tage der Herrn M, Tage des Herrn S. II, 96 Nehmet M, Nehmt S. III, 2 von weiten M, von weitem S. III, 309 daneben M, daineben S; similarly IV, 63; x, 275; XI, 383. IV, 81 Alles wußt' M, Aber wußt' S. v, 41 drauf bald M, bald drauf S. VI, 107 Drüber M, Mir darüber S. VIII, 205 die Menschen M, den Menschen S. VIII, 328 Donarius M, Denarius S. IX, 135 Braunen M, Braun S. x, 118 alle fremden M, alle fremde S, similarly XII, 107. x, 428 deinem Ranzel M, dem Ranzel S. x, 464 sich länger nicht M, nicht länger sich S. XI, 363 Martenaffe M, Martin, dem Affen S. XII, 171 empfindichsten M, empfindlichen S.

In all these instances, which could be supplemented by hundreds of others, the Munich edition has the original, correct reading, and can therefore be presumed to be the earlier of the two. On the other hand, there are also some passages, not nearly as numerous as the above, in which the Stuttgart edition has the preferable readings:

¹ *Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust*. A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University Library Staff Edited by Carl Frederick Schreiber, New Haven, 1940.

i, 229 die Sept M, die Sext S. ii, 14 ihr solltet M, ihr sollet S. iv, 260 vernahn' M (misprint), vernahn' S. v, 11 erhub M (misprint), uberhub S. v, 189 sein Herz M, ein Herz S. vi, 136 vom Hofe M, von Hofe S. vi, 384 Meiner Frau M, Meiner Frauen S. ix, 38 verkleiden M, zu verkleiden S. ix, 150 triebt M, trieb S. x, 50 wieder Bellyn M (misprint) Widder Bellyn S. xi, 202 Vetter M, Vettern S.

In some of these cases the misprint in M is so palpable that any careful compositor could correct it: in other cases, however, the correct reading is not so easily seen, and it is plausible to assume, therefore, that the Stuttgart edition goes back, not to the Munich edition, but to an independent source, at least for the proof-reading.

The thirty-six full-page engravings by Kaulbach, which are the *raison d'être* of the edition, require comment. Seventeen of them (those facing pages 1, 2, 5, 19, 25, 36, 57, 82, 84, 94, 109, 126, 139, 144, 170, 248, 252), were engraved by Ruhn. and so signed; seventeen (those facing pages 12, 13, 43, 53, 56, 59, 70, 105, 122, 124, 128, 193, 196, 227, 232, 238, 247), are signed by Schleich, who also did the engraved title; the one facing page 199 is by Steifensand, and the one facing page 255 lacks the name of the engraver. All three of my copies, two with the imprint: *München* and one with the imprint: *Stuttgart und Tübingen*, agree in these respects. In the latter edition, each engraving has the further notation: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlg.* (in the lower left corner), *München: Literar. artist. Anstalt.* (in the lower right corner), with the name of the printer between them: *Druck v. I.² Niederbühl in Stuttgart.*

All the plates of the Stuttgart and Tübingen edition agree in this notation. I have noticed no deviation. In the Munich edition, seventeen plates (those facing pages 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 19, 25, 36, 53, 56, 57, 70, 105, 128, 144, 193, 196) lack the names of the publishers; sixteen (those facing pages 43, 59, 82, 94, 109, 124, 126, 139, 199, 227, 232, 238, 247, 248, 252, 255) have: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlg. München: Literar. artist. Anstalt.* (like the Stuttgart and Tübingen edition), and the remaining three (facing pages 84, 122, 170), have: *Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhdlg. Leipzig: G. J. Göschen. München: Literar. artist. Anstalt.* This description applies to my first Munich copy: in the second copy the names of the publishers are lacking on plates facing pages 84, 122,

* On some plates it is: *J. Niederbühl.*

170, as well as on those facing pages 59 and 227. That Goeschen had a share in this edition does not seem to have been noticed hitherto.

In the first copy of the Munich edition only three plates (those facing pages 2, 193, 227) are marked as having been printed by J. Niederbühl in Stuttgart; four others (those facing pages 5, 13, 57, 196) have no indication of the printer, and the rest have various notations: *Gedr. b. Taube von Wilhelm in München* (facing pages 1, 56); *Gedruckt von Wilhelm bei Taube in München* (facing pages 53, 144); *Gedruckt v. Wilhelm in München* (facing pages 59, 82, 94, 109, 126, 139, 170, 247, 252, 255); *Gedruckt v. Joh. Wilhelm in München* (facing p. 248); *Gedruckt von W. Wick in München* (facing pages 12, 19, 25, 36, 70, 105, 199, 232); *Gedruckt v. Wick in München* (facing pages 43, 84, 238). The second copy of the Munich edition differs from the foregoing description in that the plates facing pages 105, 128 have: *Druck von J. Niederbühl in Stuttgart*; plates facing pages 59, 122, 170 are marked: *Gedruckt von Wilhelm bei Taube in München*. It is to be presumed that other copies will show slight deviations in this respect.

It is to be noted in conclusion that the first copy of the Munich edition is unique in having pasted on the board covers the wrapper of the *Zehnte Lieferung*: "Reineke Fuchs von Wolfgang v. Goethe mit Zeichnungen von Wilhelm von Kaulbach gestochen von R. Rahn und A. Schleich. Zehnte Lieferung. München. 1846. Verlag der Literarisch-artistischen Anstalt." Below the words "Zehnte Lieferung," is a woodcut, signed *WK*, in the full width of the page, depicting Reineke driving the chariot of the Cotta firm, with the date of 1640. Tied to the chariot, and dragged along behind it on the ground, is a terrified individual grasping his wig in his left hand, whilst under his right arm he has several books, on the covers of which one can decipher the words: "Kritik über Reineke Fuchs Verantwortliche Redaction des Kunstblatt Stuttgart." This woodcut, which is not repeated in the book itself, seems not to have been noticed by bibliographers.

W. KURRELMAYER

DER EINGANG DES LORSCHER BIENENSEGENS

Der erste Spruch des Lorscher Bienensegens ist entstellt überliefert; auch wer sich mit dem Wortmaterial der Handschrift abfindet, muß immer noch die Wortfolge ändern, um ein wenigstens metrisch befriedigendes Bild zu erhalten. Heute liest man allgemein,¹ unter Preisgabe des rhythmisch nicht korrigierbaren ersten Verses, im Anschluß an Steimmeyer:

Kirst, imbi ist hucze	nu fluic du, vihu minaz, hera
Fridu frono in godes munt	heim zi comonne gisunt.

Von metrischen Zerstörungen abgesehen schien der Sinn des Ganzen klar. Niemandem fiel auf, daß den Bienen geboten wird zu fliegen, nachdem sie doch schon draussen sind. Der Zauber, den man dem Bienenschwarm nachruft, hat das Ziel, das ausgeschwärmte Volk wieder zurückzuzwingen. Der Befehl "Fliege" leistet das nicht, weil das Fliegen des Schwarms gleichbedeutend mit seinem Ausfliegen ist, wie aus Vers 4 unseres Textes hervorgeht und noch der heutige Sprachgebrauch bestätigt, wo vom Fliegen der Bienen synonym mit ihrem Ausfliegen gesprochen wird. Es spricht vieles dagegen, *hera* zu *fluic* zu ziehen und zu übersetzen *fliege hierher*, z. B. die Handschrift, die *hera* gegen die Zeile so auffällig absetzt und an den Rand rückt, daß es fraglich sein kann, ob es überhaupt zur ersten Zeile gezählt werden kann.²

Es ist aber nicht nur dieses Adverb, das sich weder in das Schriftbild noch in das Metrum der Zeile fügen will und dessen Auslaut sich in der bayrischen Mundart des Wiener Hundesegens legitimer ausnimmt als im Rheinfränkischen unseres kaum vor dem Jahr 1000 aufgezeichneten Spruchs, es ist die Form *fluic*, die genauer Betrachtung nicht standhält.

¹ Seemüller schreibt *Kirstes imbi*, wobei er *vos castis ancillae domini* der Wiener Handschrift 751 im Auge hat und die Wolfsturner Handschrift, die von den Bienen sagt: *Ain dieren gotes, die do wurcht ein werk gotes des herren*.—Wenn überhaupt eine Korrektur, dann jedenfalls *Kirsti imbi* mit Verschleifung der beiden *i*; so daß überhaupt keine eigentliche Konjekturen nötig ist.

² "Daß *hera heim* zusammengehören, ist wohl die allgemeine Ansicht; dann darf man aber die beiden Worte nicht trennen" (Koegel I, 2, 187); "*hera* kann zu dem von der Überlieferung durcheinandergeworfenen Wortmaterial der zweiten Langzeile gerechnet werden." (Unwerth: *Beiträge XLII* [1918], 117 f.).

Der gleiche Imperativ steht in Vers 4 als *fluc*. Bei einem so flüchtigen Schreiber besagt das nicht viel, man würde die Variante passieren lassen, wäre sicher, er hätte so geschrieben. Pfeiffer, der übrigens *fluic* liest, hat seinem Aufsatz ein Facsimile beigegeben, aus dem so viel sicher zu sehen ist, daß weder *fluic* noch gar *fluic* geschrieben ist. Unentscheidbar, ob die ersten Buchstaben als *fd* oder *fol* zu lesen sind, das Folgende ist jedenfalls *wic* oder *nic*. Nicht möglich ist die Auflösung in *fluc* d. h. in die einzige im Spruch sonst belegte Form. Wer *fluic* liest, nimmt an, daß der Schreiber sich verbessert hat; aber wenn er im Wortanfang änderte und *fdwic* > *fluic* korrigierte, warum hat er dann das falsche *i* stehen lassen? Änderte er den zweiten Buchstaben, aber den vierten nicht? So wird man wohl richtiger mit der Handschrift *folnic* lesen und darunter einen regulären Imperativ des regulären Verb *fol-nigan* verstehen. Ähnliche Bildungen sind *fol-faran* = 'einen Weg völlig zurücklegen,' *folla-queman* = 'zu Ende kommen.' *Fol-nic* = *wende dich völlig* ist der rechte beschwörende Anruf der Bienen nach ihrem Ausschwarmen.

Was soll mit *hera* werden? es wirkt schwach und überflüssig, ob man es nun mit *heim* oder mit *folnic* in Verbindung bringt; so daß ich der durch die Schreibung nahegelegten Versuchung, es ganz zu tilgen und als Schreiberreminiszenz an andere Reisesegen zu erklären, nachgeben würde, hielte mich nicht eine Erwägung zurück:

Der Spruch ist vom Standpunkt des Magischen aus mangelhaft. Man vergleiche seinen dürftigen Wortlaut mit der magischen Eindringlichkeit des zweiten Spruchs, der mit Zeile 3 einsetzt. Schon das gedoppelte *sizi* ist weit überlegen. Die Doppelung *hurolob ni habe du—zi holze ni fluc du* und noch schöner im nächsten Vers *noh du mir nindrinnes—noh du mir nintwinnest* zeigt, worauf es bei der Beschwörung ankommt. Es ist mein stärkster Einwand gegen die beiden Eingangszeilen, wie sie vorliegen, daß sie alles vermissen lassen, was wir von einem magischen Spruch erwarten. Sie leisten die Arbeit der Beschwörung nicht. Vergeblich suchen wir nach Parallelismus oder Variation. Ein schwacher Rest magischer Technik ist in dem Zusammentritt der erstarrten Alliteration *frido frono* mit *in godes munt* zu erblicken. Diese synonymen Phrasen sind aus der altgermanischen Rechtssprache überkommen, deren Sinn ebenfalls darauf gerichtet war, zu binden, zu verpflichten, in beschwörender Eindringlichkeit auf

den Willen dessen zu wirken, der dem Richterspruch unterlag. Grade diese Seite der Beeinflussung ist mit dem einmaligen Imperativ, sei er nun *wende dich* oder *fliege*, ganz unzureichend berücksichtigt. Was da fehlt, ist die Wiederholung. Es müsste ein variiender Imperativ hinzutreten, so wie zu *indrinnan* -*intwinnan*. Noch einmal und stärker, unterstrichen und doppelt müsste gesagt werden, was binden und bannen soll.

Das würde das Wort *kere* leisten, das ich anstelle von *hera* vorschlage:³

Wende dich völlig, mein Vieh, kehre dich!
Im Gottesfrieden, in Gottes Hut heimzukommen.

Einem Schreiber, der in ein- und derselben Zeile *indrinnest* mit *d*, *intwinnest* mit *t*, die Verbalendung einmal als -*es*, das zweite Mal als -*est* schreibt, der nach allgemeiner Annahme seine Worte durcheinandergeraten läßt, wird kein bitteres Unrecht zugefügt, wenn man ihm die Verwechslung von *k* und *h* zutraut. Nur diese; denn er sprach wahrscheinlich schon *here*. Die volle Endung ist nur der Nachklang einer alten sakralen Formel, wie sie im Wiener Hundesegeu vorliegt. Unter dem Einfluß der noch geläufigen Heimkehrsegen veränderte sich ihm *kere* also nicht einfach in *here*, das seine *Sprechform* ist, sondern für *here* schob sich ihm die *Spruchform* *hera* unter.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Yale University

REVIEWS

Arthur, Dux Bellorum. By ARTHUR G. BRODEUR. Berkeley: University of California Publications in English, III, 237-284, 1939.

The reader will recall that, in the *Historia Brittonum*, Nennius introduces the name of Arthur with the words:

Tunc Arthur pugnabat contr'illos in illis diebus
Cum regibus Brittonum, sed ipse dux erat bellorum.

The passage has long been an historical crux, and Professor Brodeur addresses himself to it with masterly precision, learning,

³ *kere* aus älterem *keri* schon bei Otfrid, später bei Notker.

and acuity. He says at the outset: "Was there an Arthur who led British forces against the Saxons? If so, when did he flourish, and in what part of Britain? With what phase of the struggle were his activities concerned?"

Gildas, who wrote about 500 A. D. (about two centuries before the oldest portions of Nennius), does not mention Arthur, but he deals with the coming of the Saxons, which he dates some time after 446. This dating agrees with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which, following Bede, dates the first Saxon invasion in 449. Thurneysen and Ferdinand Lot, however, have questioned this testimony because certain Gallic chronicles report that the provinces of Britain became subject to the Saxons by the year 441-442, and both the *Historia Brittonum* and the *Annales Cambriae* aver that the Saxons first came in 428. In the first section of his treatise Brodeur proves, I think, that Gildas was right: the Saxon invasion, apart from "sporadic raids," did not take place until 447.¹

Section II deals with Nennius' relation to "a *Liber Sancti Germani*" (not the fifth-century *Vita* by Constantius) and the consequent "distortions" Nennius made in the material that came to him from Gildas. The most interesting point made here is the observation that "since Vortigern's name is British [the *superbus tyrannus* of Gildas], and his immediate realm seems to have been Wales, his opposition to Ambrosius [the character in Gildas whom Arthur replaces] is to be explained on the ground of the historical conflict in interest between the prevailingly Celtic north and west of Britain and the Romanized east and south." That conflict erupted into civil war, and it is clear that Gildas (and later Nennius) is on the Roman side. In the victories over the Saxons (actually, the Jutes) Nennius names a battle at Episford, where he says Horsa was slain; the victor is Guorthemir, a fictitious person who, according to Brodeur, was substituted by Nennius for Ambrosius. Brodeur's theory is that *Episford* may be identified with *Ægelsthrep*, where the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* places the death of Horsa in 455. That is an ingenious suggestion, but it amounts to little more. It is true, if we subtract the 44 years mentioned by Gildas from the date of the Battle of Badon (about 500), "we arrive at the date 456" for the activities of Ambrosius; nevertheless, there remains the problem of names, and these differ materially from one another.

This brings us to the *Arthuriana* proper—in section III—the central theme of the treatise. Here, I may say frankly, my own views are at considerable variance with those of Brodeur. Lack of space prevents my discussing them fully here; moreover, my own theory has now been set forth in an article appearing in *Modern*

¹ In note 12 a reference might have been made to Lot, *Nennius et l'Historia Brittonum*, p. 2, where Lot admits the untrustworthy character of the Chartres MS.

Philology.² However, it is essential to point out that Brodeur enunciates the theory that "Arthur was the great national champion against the Jutes,"—a belief, he argues, which can scarcely be later than the seventh century. Arthur's battles must, therefore, be placed in the South. "Not only does British tradition make him the hero of Badon; the *Arthuriana* fixes his activities against the Jutes, . . . and the *Annales Cambriae* dates his death at a time when there was no serious warfare with the Saxons north of the upper Thames Valley." How this unknown hero happened to bear the name of "Arthur" he nowhere adequately explains. As for the sentence (*Tunc Arthur pugnabat* etc.) with which Nennius introduces his name, Brodeur holds that it is pre-Nennian, "lifted," he says, "from a British-Latin poem in hexameters—perhaps a verse chronicle." But, and here is the crux, "the enumeration of battles which immediately follows this sentence . . . could not have been drawn from any work embodying genuine tradition."

Had Brodeur read the works of Malone, Lot, and Thurneysen on this question with the care that he devotes to his other material, he would, I think, have expressed himself differently. See Lot (*Nennius*, pp. 78, 112, and 130), where it is shown that not only was Arthur, in the words of Faral, "quelque chef breton du Nord," but there are cogent reasons for thinking that the majority of the battles listed indicates the territory of his activities; so that it is by no means precluded that the battles embody "genuine tradition." Lot summarizes what I believe to be the correct attitude in the words:

Qu'importe après tout que les chapitres où l'on parle d'Arthur soient de Nennius rédigeant en 826, ou d'un prédécesseur du siècle précédent? Ce détail est secondaire. Ce qui demeure c'est que la légende arthurienne existait. Arthur était déjà un héros national, sinon un roi on nous en avertit [*sed ipse dum erat bellorum*]. Ses exploits guerriers étaient localisés alors dans le Nord de la Bretagne.

As for the twelfth battle, that of Mount Badon, which Brodeur, relying on the relatively late *Annales Cambriae*, considers so important, Lot has this quite simple explanation (p. 70):

Ce nom est emprunté à Gildas (c. 26), lequel nous avertit qu'il écrit 44 ans [see below, note 6] après cette bataille qui fut un grand succès pour les Bretons. Mais il ne parle pas d'Arthur et ne fournit pas la plus légère précision sur ce Mont-Badon.

It would follow, then, that Nennius (or the Pseudo-Nennius) introduced the exploits of Arthur, a northern hero, into the Gildas-Bede account of the struggle of the romanized British of the South against the Saxons or Jutes. This was done by lumping the eleven

² 39 (1941), 7-14. On p. 14, note 1, I incorrectly stated that Professor Jackson identified Catraeth with Carriden; as a matter of fact he agrees, with some reservations, that it is *Catterick*.

original battles³ of Arthur with the Battle of Badon, with which he originally had nothing to do. Thus a northern hero—whose real enemies were not the Saxons but the Picts and Scots—comes to replace in the text of Nennius the Ambrosius Aurelianus of Gildas.

It is obvious, I think that both Arthur and Ambrosius are Roman names. Arthur is the Roman family name Artorius, the *dux legionum*, paralleling Nennius' *dux bellorum*, in the well-known CIL account of him discussed by Malone in *MP.*, 22 (1924-5), 367-74.⁴ Thurneysen (*ZCPH.*, 20 [1933], 136) accepts Malone's identification, though with the introduction of a singular vagary of his own. What seems to me, however, so significant in Malone's discovery is the fact that L. Artorius Castus—the *dux* in question—was the commander of the important Roman Sixth Legion while it was stationed in Britain and took an illustrious part in the construction of both the Hadrian and the Antonine Walls⁵ in the North, the region in which Anscombe and others have localized several of the Arthurian battles found in Nennius.

Hence it would follow that in Nennius' shift of Arthur from the North to the South, from a Roman fighting the Picts and Scots to a Brito-Roman fighting the Saxons, we have an epic parallel to Roland; this hero, properly a Frank, defeated by the Basques, underwent a shift to Roland, the national hero of the French, defeated by the Saracens.

In section IV Brodeur shows clearly the confusions and contradictions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. He agrees with Chadwick and Myres, rightly I think, that the account "of Cerdic's wars is a West Saxon attempt to filch credit for Jutish exploits." Gildas is trustworthy. "Badon [Mount] must have been a victory over the Jutes." In his last section (V) Brodeur takes seriously what the *Annales Cambriae* say about Arthur and Medraut at Camlann.⁶ I am still inclined to regard this event as fiction, the source of which I do not know. Nor can I accept the statement that

³ See Lot, p. 68, for his view of Anscombe's and Faral's identifications. In the main, I agree with Lot; but I have not space to discuss his views here.

⁴ See Brodeur, p. 279, where Artorius is relegated to a footnote

⁵ On this, see Sir George MacDonald, *The Roman Wall in Scotland*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1934, esp. p. 409.

⁶ All that we actually know about Camlann, is that the name contains the rather frequent Celtic element *cam-* (from *kambo* 'crooked'); see Eilert Ekwall, *English River Names*, pp. 64-68. The most recent attempt to locate Camlann in the North is by O. G. S. Crawford, *Antiquity* 1935, pp. 289-90. While I agree with Brodeur (p. 283) that Crawford's 'philology' is not faultless, the latter includes in his article a useful suggestion by Kenneth Jackson that Nennius' *Linnuis* may be Lindensia, modern Lindsey (although Lindisfarne also comes to mind). This strikes me as sound, certainly on the phonological side; on Lindensia as a district, see Collingwood and Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, Oxford, 1936, pp. 412-16, and pp. 460-61, on the question of Badon.

Arthur's and Medraud's death "at Camlann [mentioned by the *Annales*] suggests that Modred's opposition to Arthur may derive from genuine tradition rather than from the imagination of Geoffrey of Monmouth." That is the type of positivism in scholarship which I think we should avoid.⁷

This interesting and well-written little treatise concludes with three appendices; one on the "Dates for the Coming of the Saxons," another on that of the "Siege of Mount Badon," and a third (actually Appendix II) seeking to justify the theory that the passage (*Tunc Arthur pugnabat contr' illos in illis diebus*) can be scanned as hexameters. It would serve Brodeur's theory as well as mine, if this hypothesis could be upheld! But that is doubtful.

WM. A. NITZE

University of Chicago

Letters of William Shenstone. Edited with an Introduction by DUNCAN MALLAM. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, [1939]. Pp. xxxvi + 475. \$7.50.

The Letters of William Shenstone. Arranged and Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index by MARJORIE WILLIAMS. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. xxviii + 700. 32s. 6d.

When Hans Hecht published, in 1909, a series of letters exchanged by Shenstone and Thomas Percy, the small volume was cordially welcomed by *Modern Language Notes* in a review of nearly 4,000 words (xxvii (1912), 19-25). The reviewer—W. H. Hulme—thought that Shenstone was at long last revealed as "a gifted letter-writer," possessed of a "charming epistolary style almost equal to Cowper's." He went on at length to show how the newly discovered letters refuted charges against Shenstone made by some of his contemporaries, and how they exhibited the poet as "a man of broad and profound learning, of deep human sympathy and interests," and "of exquisite taste in the best things of literature and art." Many changes have occurred since this notice appeared. For one thing, in these sterner days reviewers for *MLN* can no longer indulge in the luxury of expatiation which Hulme enjoyed. But not everything has changed. Interest in Shenstone has continued, and increased. Hulme's estimate cannot now be accepted without serious qualification; yet Shenstone remains entertaining and significant, and it will not be disputed that there was need for a complete collection of his extant letters.

No need existed, however, for two attempts at such a collection;

⁷ On the Arthur of certain British saints, see Tatlock, *Speculum* 14 (1939), 345.

and it is a matter for something more than regret that the two editions listed above appeared simultaneously, in January, 1939. Miss Williams was first on the job, and everybody, including Mr. Mallam, has known for some years what she was doing. She announced that she was at work on her edition in July, 1933 (*RES*, ix, 291). In 1935, in the Preface to her *William Shenstone, A Chapter in Eighteenth Century Taste*, she repeated her announcement. Furthermore, in the M. H. R. A. bulletin, *Work in Progress*, 1938, she was listed as still engaged in this undertaking. Nobody knew that Mr. Mallam, at the University of Minnesota, had entered into competition with Miss Williams. His own explanation of his enterprising endeavour in gum-shoes deserves not only quotation, but a more prominent position than he gives it in a footnote to his prefatorial "Editor's Note," dated "November, 1938": "We learn," he says, "as we go to press, of a forthcoming edition of the letters of Shenstone by Miss Marjorie Williams, a book of which we had long since reluctantly despaired and which we now welcome with renewed interest." Mr. Mallam's interest can easily be imagined; but the facts in this case speak for themselves and need no ironical or other emphasis. Miss Williams was not, considering the magnitude and difficulty of the task, unreasonably long in completing her edition. Obviously, moreover, Mr. Mallam did not take the trouble to get into communication with her. Obviously, too, his own work, however hasty, must have required a not inconsiderable time. His reluctant despair, therefore, must have been a quite alarming mushroom growth.

Mr. Mallam seeks to disarm criticism of another kind by modestly stating that his edition "cannot make any pretence of even approaching the definitive"; though he goes on at once to say, not only that he has printed everything he could find, but that "it is hard to believe" other letters, if they turn up, can "be of sufficient number or importance to change our estimate or greatly increase our understanding of the man who wrote them." This seems to mean that his edition is, after all, as close an approach to "the definitive" as is humanly possible when letters are in question. But, no matter what Mr. Mallam means or says, he has in effect demanded comparison with Miss Williams, cannot escape it, and cannot object to it. And comparison, as we shall see, leads to no uncertain conclusion.

Miss Williams has 313 letters, and, in addition, prints Shenstone's "Billets," which she and Professor Irving L. Churchill (who first published them in not quite complete form, *PMLA*, LII, 1937, 114-121) rightly regard as "an integral part of the Percy-Shenstone correspondence." Mr. Mallam does not print the "Billets" and has only 284 letters. Miss Williams has 125 letters not previously printed in any form, as against Mr. Mallam's 96. But these figures do not tell everything about the search of the two

editors, because Mr. Mallam has seven letters not in Miss Williams's volume, and she has, consequently, 36 not in his.

None of the manuscripts used by either editor has been easily accessible to this reviewer, but many of Shenstone's letters exist today only in versions printed by Dodsley in the volume of *Letters to Particular Friends* which he published in 1769 as Vol. III of the first collected edition of Shenstone's *Works*. A comparison of several of the letters with their sources in Dodsley shows that neither editor is impeccable in transcription, but shows also that Mr. Mallam departs from Dodsley's text far more often, and more seriously, than Miss Williams. For the letters compared (Dodsley's r, xx, xli, and c), Miss Williams shows 16 departures, and Mr. Mallam 45. Most of these departures, in both books, are insignificant, consisting of omitted periods, commas, hyphens, or dashes; but Mr. Mallam fails seriously in transcription fairly often, whereas Miss Williams does not similarly fail once. For example, in Dodsley's Letter xx Shenstone writes, "I am not yet satisfied about mottoes," and Mr. Mallam omits "yet." Later in the same letter Shenstone writes, "One caution I gave Mr. W—," which Mr. Mallam prints "One caution I gave to Mr. G—," adding in a footnote that "Mr. G—" is "probably Graves." Again, in Dodsley's Letter c, Shenstone writes that a picture which Alecock was painting (the portrait of him now in the National Portrait Gallery) is "two feet, three inches and three-quarters" in width, which Mr. Mallam transforms into "three feet two inches and three quarters." When he is printing from manuscript sources, it should be added, Mr. Mallam occasionally leaves blanks indicating, he says, that the manuscript is defective; but Miss Williams fills in most of these blanks without remark. This difference arises, no doubt, from the difficulty of working exclusively from rotographs; but neither that difficulty, nor any other easy to imagine except simple negligence, will explain Mr. Mallam's omission of a large part of his Letter 68, and of parts of his Letter 89. It should also be mentioned here that he omits a long postscript to his Letter 184. In this case, however, the reason is that the postscript at some time got separated from the letter and finally landed in the Library of the University of Texas, where Miss Williams found it and Mr. Mallam did not.

The two editors differ in a number of cases in their efforts to date the letters, and also, less often, in their identifications of persons addressed. Sometimes one guess is as good as another; but in most instances Miss Williams appears to be right. Yet to this there is one important exception: Miss Williams's Letter 292 clearly should precede her Letter 290, and Mr. Mallam has these letters (269 and 270 in his edition) in the right order.

Professor Cecil A. Moore contributes a graceful Preface to Mr. Mallam's volume, towards the close of which he commends the notes:

"Of the annotations it need be said only that they are an indispensable help even to readers familiar with the period and could have been provided only by a competent and conscientious scholar." Doubtless he would now like to obliterate these words; for Miss Williams's notes are immeasurably superior to Mr. Mallam's, and show him up for the tiro he is. Mr. Mallam, for example, does not attempt to identify a single Latin quotation, whereas Miss Williams tracks down every one. The difference between the two may be further illustrated by their notes to a passage in the last paragraph of Miss Williams's Letter 109 (Mr. Mallam's 112). Shenstone is thanking Lady Luxborough for her civility to a Mr. Pearsall, his relation, and goes on to allude to a book being written by him. Mr. Mallam's note reads: "I have not with any certainty been able to trace either Mr. Pearsall or his book." Miss Williams's note reads:

Richard Pearsall (1698-1762), religious writer in the manner of Rev. James Hervey. Some of his poems appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1736. The book to which W. S. refers is probably *Contemplations on the Ocean, Harvest, Sickness and the last Judgment, in a series of letters to a friend*, 1753. The family of Pearsall of Hawn finds mention in Nash's *History of Worcestershire*.

Miss Williams may or may not be right about the book; and it should be said that she fails to explain or to identify some allusions. But in general she brings adequate learning and mastery of the relevant facts into effective play, and acquits herself well in her use of her material. She keeps her notes from running into too much space, but does present the letters in their setting; and in particular she makes it easily possible to map out Shenstone's reading. Mr. Mallam, one must add, like too many graduate students of the present generation, shows himself unable to handle evidence properly when he does have it. For example, in a long note on p. 47 he wrestles with the question of Shenstone's visits to London in the early 1740's, shows everybody who has preceded him to have been more or less wrong, and then jumps to an unwarranted conclusion. It has been thought that Shenstone visited London early, or fairly early, in 1741, 1742, 1743, and 1744. Mr. Mallam triumphantly points out that, as regards 1743, we have only Shenstone's "declaration of intention to set out for London 'some time next week,'" and no direct first-hand information that he actually did go. We do not have, either, any information showing or suggesting that he failed to go; but Mr. Mallam's conclusion is that he was not there at all in 1743. (Other examples of the unwarranted conclusion are to be found in note 1, p. 269, and in note 3, p. 461.)

This comparison could be extended further, but enough has been said to show how it must end. Mr. Mallam's edition is definitely inferior in every respect to Miss Williams's. Neither edition is

complete, and both exhibit faults of execution, but Miss Williams is head and shoulders above the gentleman from Minnesota at every point. The one reason for the existence of Mr. Mallam's book is the seven letters he includes which eluded Miss Williams's search. These come pretty high at a trifle over \$1.07 apiece, and none of them is essential for any ordinary purpose of any reader or student.

It is possible to add only a word concerning the large number of letters now first printed by the rival editors, or now first gathered together and made easily accessible. The most important of these fall into two series, the letters addressed to Lady Luxborough, and the notes addressed to John Scott Hylton. The former are certainly useful, indeed valuable, but they can add nothing to Shenstone's reputation as a letter-writer. They become tiresome before one is through with them, just as their writer became tired of Lady Luxborough. The notes to Hylton, however, one would not have missed for anything. And the letters as a whole form a treasurable addition to eighteenth-century literature. They do not place Shenstone alongside Cowper, or Walpole, or even Gray. He remains somewhere behind the front ranks of the English letter-writers. But he had more substance and his life had more meaning than has often been thought; and his letters, now that they are gathered together, permit us to see at first-hand, minutely, justly, and entertainingly, one of the more attractive fruits of modern culture—the eighteenth-century man of taste in his daily activities.

ROBERT SIAFER

University of Cincinnati

John Skelton, Laureate. By WILLIAM NELSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. vi + 266. \$3.00.

Although the publishers advertise William Nelson's *John Skelton, Laureate* as the "first full length biography in English of a poet who has gained increasing attention in recent years," the author in his Introduction describes his book as "an uncomfortable compromise between a collection of scattered papers concerning John Skelton and an orderly 'Life and Works.'" Through his long study of the works and his patient and painstaking search in the libraries and archives of America and England, Mr. Nelson discovered so many fascinating problems, or Skeltonic cruxes, that he wisely decided to place his emphasis on these rather than on phases that are better understood. So, although he traces Skelton's career from his earliest poetic efforts and even includes a chapter on "Reputation and Influence," he is most interested in placing Skelton in the Humanist tradition and relating him to the other

figures of Henry VII's court and in solving some of the problems connected with the less studied poems. He divides his work into eleven chapters: "The Scholars of Henry VII," "John Skelton, Humanist," "Tutor to the Prince," "The Origin of the Skeltonic Rhyme," "Skelton at Diss," "The Court of Henry VIII," "The Grammarians' War," "*Speak, Parrot*," "The Quarrel with Wolsey," "Reputation and Influence." He includes six appendices, a bibliography, and an index.

Nelson is of the opinion that his most significant contribution is his interpretation of *Speak, Parrot* and the relationship of it to Skelton's quarrel with Wolsey. This interpretation is based upon the author's solution of Skelton's peculiar calendar. He is able to show that the dates which are scattered through the second part of *Speak, Parrot*, and are given as "33" and "34," are related to the "21" which is to be found on one of Skelton's signatures. By dating this signature as of 1509 and relating the date to the "33" and "34," Mr. Nelson is able to show rather conclusively that the second section of *Speak, Parrot* should be dated in the fall of 1521. These dates and certain hints in the poem indicate that Skelton is here making a reference to Cardinal Wolsey's trip to the continent in 1521, and that the poet in the second part of *Speak, Parrot* is referring to the failure of Wolsey's mission and twitting him on some of his mistakes. I agree with Mr. Nelson that this chapter is a very important contribution. It is significant for its conclusions, but it is also a very valuable lesson in method, for it shows the result of a careful reading of an obscure poem with the light that can be thrown on it from a thorough knowledge of other works of the period, and the result of a careful, first-hand study of all manuscripts and printed works. Another interesting contribution is Mr. Nelson's theory of the origin of the Skeltonic rhyme. After discussing and rejecting previous theories, he comes to the conclusion that Skelton's "bastard rhyme" represents "an exaggerated development of the classical prose figure, 'like ending.'" I found the reasoning in this chapter very convincing. Students of the early Tudor period will be particularly interested in the first chapters and the discussion of the re-habilitation of Latin because of the necessity of the rulers to have men in their employ who could write and speak in Latin. Oratory and rhetoric were, therefore, of prime importance to courtiers and diplomats. Skelton was one of those early grammarians who achieved fame and some fortune in the courts of Henry the VIIIth and Henry the VIIIth.

Nelson has written with enthusiasm for his poet and his material, but he has avoided the temptation to allow his enthusiasm to cause him to do the usual appreciative work. Such a work appeared just before Nelson's book in the *John Skelton, An Account of His Life and Writings* by L. J. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd's work is a chronological

résumé of Skelton's life, and an analysis of his writings. His criticism is almost entirely of the appreciative type, although he doesn't approve of all of Skelton's work. Nelson's work is a patient, exhaustive study of all the evidence which concerns certain problems in connection with Skelton. Although Nelson shows a great liking for and a full appreciation of Skelton's poetry, he is unwilling simply to give opinions and judgments without evidence. The book is sound, scholarly, and a very readable work.

RAY HEFFNER

The University of Washington

Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus, von FRIEDRICH JOSEPH SCHMITZ. *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, Vol. 23. University of California Press, Berkeley, California 1941. 152 pp.

The author begins with an analysis of European Individualism, which, in his opinion, grew out of the movements of Renaissance and Humanism, and attained its ideological peak in Central Europe during the eighteenth century. Although individualism is not clearly defined by the author, we may assume that he had two concepts of individualism in mind: on the one hand, an irrational approach to the theoretical problems of philosophy, and, on the other hand, a subjective attitude towards practical, moral and religious life. In this sense, the idea of individualism developed by Schmitz is to a certain extent related to the idea of qualitative individualism.

However, the author was not primarily interested in a full analysis of European individualism, but rather in its influence upon one of the leading personalities of cultural life in Central Europe at the time when the first climax of individualism was reached. This was Lessing, who (we follow the text of Schmitz) for the first time viewed moral, religious and literary questions from a particularly individualistic standpoint. Never before, not even by Klopstock, had such an individualistic standpoint been maintained, although there were many attempts by German writers to fight the anti-individualistic Scholasticism.

This is the gist of Schmitz's work. If it is true, we should expect a surprisingly new portrait of Lessing. For the present, however, Schmitz only wanted to prepare the material for such a picture. In this way, specifically strong irrational and subjective tendencies of letters, essays, poems and dramas of the young Lessing, a new essence of the *Litteratur-Briefe*, *Laokoon* and *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, new ideas within his *Emilia Galotti* and *Minna von Barnhelm* are laid bare. Thus, Lessing certainly seems to have

advocated a philosophy "von der aus das Leben nicht mehr rein verstandesmassig nach einer seichten Zweckmassigkeit beurteilt und abgeurteilt werden konnte, sondern in seiner tieferen Bedeutung und seinem tieferen Zusammenhang als solches gewertet werden konnte und mußte" (p. 58, 59).

Such a view of Lessing's character and work is opposed not only to the former studies on Lessing in which Lessing was taken for one of the most outstanding representatives of Enlightenment, but also to those studies and biographies of Lessing in which certain pietistic tendencies within Lessing's philosophy were conceded. Schmitz insists on irrationalism as the fundamental basis of Lessing's character and work.

One of the most striking facts of this study is that the author does not analyze Lessing's chief work, *Nathan the Wise*. It is likewise not clear why he does not discuss Lessing's "Humanitätsideal" and the problem of how far such an "Humanitätsideal", that obviously was in contrast to any individualistic outlook of life, could be combined with Lessing's alleged individualism. Although Schmitz quotes Jacobi, who revealed Lessing's Spinozism (p. 54, 55), he does not explain Lessing's particular adherence to Spinoza's philosophy in contrast to the different Spinozistic philosophies of Storm and Stress and Romanticism.

As a matter of fact, Lessing participated in certain individualistic tendencies of Pietism and Enlightenment. These tendencies chiefly served to substitute the missing ties of social and religious life that had crumbled with the downfall of medieval culture. In this way is to be explained the interest not only of Lessing, but also of most of his contemporaries, in secret alliances, freemasonry, etc. But we will not call such tendencies "individualistic", generally speaking.

The methodological standpoint of the author demands a special remark. He is of the opinion that within history the individual is not merely the product of the culture of his period, but also commands and controls this culture. Be that as it may (and certainly it is very different from such a simple characterization), the author is very much mistaken if he has found the history of ideas responsible for anti-individualistic historiography (pp. 1, 22, 64, etc.). Just the history of ideas lifted the individual to a higher level of importance, giving to him the new function that is defined by the term "Leistungsstruktur". That is, however, not the heroic individual that the author is looking for.

Since enthusiasm as well as the spirit of aggression is the privilege of youth (and Schmitz seems to be a young scholar) his study is to be taken more as a test of talent than as a conclusive scientific result. We certainly may expect valuable work from this author as soon as he has calmed the rapid pace of his thoughts. Finally, he may be advised to watch his German style carefully, if he continues to write in German.

GEORGE STEFANSKY

City College, New York

Five Studies in Literature. By B. H. BRONSON, J. R. CALDWELL, J. M. CLINE, GORDON MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1940. Pp. 153. \$1.50.

These studies "were written to be published together," according to a prefatory statement; but the reviewer would find it so hard to describe what they have in common that his best resource is to notice them one by one, in the same chronological order in which they are here arranged.

Prof. B. H. Bronson (*Chaucer's Art in Relation to his Audience*) takes audience in its strict sense: listeners. What, he asks, was the effect upon Chaucer's narrative art of the oral rendition of his stories, which he must, sometimes at least, have contemplated? His focus wavers somewhat, and he seems at times to be discussing Chaucer's narrative technique in general. Yet he gathers a useful sheaf of observations that are strictly relevant. (He might profitably have cited the *Orlando Furioso* among instances of the oral custom he is concerned with.)

Prof. J. F. Ross (*Hamlet as Dramatist*) has as his theme "Hamlet's self-dramatization plus his dramaturgic temperament as a whole." This is to say, what Hamlet does and is constitutes in his own mind a rôle that he plays, and his delay in action (of which so many explanations have been made) is partly due to his desire to make his action as dramatic as possible. Prof. Ross's argument certainly adds something to our idea of the "melancholic" prince.

Prof. J. M. Cline (*Hydriolaphia*) is concerned with the paradoxical union in Sir Thomas Browne's thought of radical skepticism and Christian faith. He has no trouble in showing that the paradox is a familiar one in the seventeenth century, and is clearly stated and honestly faced in Browne's familiar quotation from Tertullian, *credo quia impossibile est*; but he is perhaps less convincing in trying to show that *Urn-burial* is the expression of paradox in aesthetic terms, both its construction and its style being (he argues) framed in the form of a conflict of contraries.

Prof. Gordon McKenzie (*Swift: Reason and some of its Consequences*) attempts to show that reason, in Swift's use, is not unlike Descartes' "rational intuition." It is, first, an immediate and direct apprehension of truth, not a logical process, and, secondly, it is absolutely right and certain. From reason, as so understood, and from the supplementary concept "common sense," Mr. McKenzie derives some of Swift's notable characteristics: his distrust of science, his love of unity and orthodoxy in church and state, and his intolerance, for instance. This is a closely-reasoned and (considering the nature of its subject) a clearly-reasoned study.

Finally, Prof. James R. Caldwell ("*Beauty is Truth . . .*")

studies Keats's famous dictum in the light of Hazlitt's aesthetic theorizing. It is probably true that Hazlitt helped Keats toward the idea that truth and beauty are one and indivisible, and it is certainly worth while to know this, and we should understand better what Keats meant if only we could be sure that we knew what *Hazlitt* meant. Mr. Caldwell does something, probably as much as possible, with this problem, but still not quite enough.

MORRIS W. CROLL

Princeton University

BRIEF MENTION

Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien. Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Volkshedarchiv. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1939. Teil II, Zweite Hälfte, pp. xi, 219-308. Teil III, Erste Hälfte, pp. 1-140. This monumental edition of German folksong is continued by two new half-volumes which bring the number of ballads now edited up to 59. The detailed study of the themes and the music has become even more extensive than in the earlier volumes and some of the introductions of the songs are veritable treatises. The discussion of "Ritter and Magd," for example, occupies no less than 45 quarto pages. The aspects of the *Deutsche Volkslieder* which deserve especial commendation are the exhaustive study of the history of the songs and the novel methods in the analysis of the musical texts. American ballad scholars seem not to have discovered these introductions. At least, I have not seen Meier's study of "Ritter and Magd" (III, 32-33) cited for its mention of "Lord Lovel" (Child, No. 75), "Fair Margaret and Sweet William" (Child, No. 74), "Lord Thomas and Fair Annet" (Child, No. 73), and "Lady Alice" (Child, No. 85) and its elaborate classification of related themes in European balladry, and the same might be said of many another introductory note. The introductory notes are quite in the manner set by Francis James Child, but the available texts have multiplied amazingly and the problems are correspondingly involved and difficult. The number of Modern Greek parallels which are cited is surprising, and this is but one sort of erudition which these introductions exemplify. The treatment of the music is beyond my competence to judge, but it is sufficient to say that even a tyro perceives that new methods are employed and new results are achieved. The *Deutsche Volkslieder* will stimulate the study of folksong as its great predecessors, Grundtvig's *Danmarks gamle folkeviser* and Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, have done.

ARCHER TAYLOR

The University of California, Berkeley

The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon. Edited, with an Introduction, by CHARLES F. MULLETT. San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 64. \$1.75. A well-edited batch of letters from Dr. George Cheyne, Samuel Richardson's friend and physician, to the pious and sickly Selina, Countess of Huntingdon. Since they deal almost exclusively with her ladyship's digestive tract and the doctor's attempts to alleviate its ills by means of a rather faddish diet, their scope is as specialized as the most scholarly heart could desire. The letters would be of some value to students of medical practice and professional manners in the eighteenth century, but one hardly sees why the editor refers to them as "an interesting semiprofessional and social correspondence."

HOXIE N. FAIRCHILD

Hunter College

The Oxford Book of Christian Verse. Chosen and edited by LORD DAVID CECIL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. xxxiv + 560. \$3.00. An anthology of English religious verse drawn from "writers whose poems . . . are consistent with the doctrines of orthodox Christianity." Blake is the only heretic, and T. S. Eliot the only American. Your reviewer will not indulge in the futility of asking why this poem was included or that poem omitted: in such matters there can be no absolute standard. Lord Cecil knows English poetry better than most Christians, and he knows Christianity better than most students of literature. The result is a volume which reveals very impressively the power of the Christian religion to stimulate poetic utterance.

The twenty-two page Introduction offers some interesting critical observations on religious poetry but regrettably adds a misleadingly thin and hasty sketch of the history of the subject. The compiler says: "A representative anthology of English Christian Verse has also an additional non-literary interest. Christianity wears a different face to different people in different periods. . . . A collection of English Christian Verse is both a history of Christianity in England and an exhibition of the varieties of the religious temperament." Fortunately the text itself does not suggest that Lord Cecil has attempted the impossible task of combining critical and historical standards, for almost all of the poems seem to have been chosen for their intrinsic merit. The volume, while of course historically suggestive, is in no sense a tool of scholarship. It is simply a book from which the scholar may derive a great deal of literary pleasure and spiritual refreshment.

HOXIE N. FAIRCHILD

Hunter College

A Book of Danish Ballads, selected and with an introduction by AXEL OLRİK; translated by E. M. SMITH-DAMPIER. Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 337. \$3.00. This attractive volume was printed and published by the Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation. It is based on Orlík's two collections, *Danske Folkeviser i Udvalg* (1899) and *Danske Folkeviser i Udvalg, Anden Samling* (1909), which in turn were drawn from *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*, the monumental work begun by Svend Grundtvig, continued by Orlík, and still incomplete after nearly 100 years of meticulous scholarly labor. Miss Smith-Dampier has given us English translations of 82 ballads, divided into the following groups: warrior ballads and ballads of magic (16); historical ballads (15); ballads of chivalry (18); ballads of satire (2); and miscellaneous ballads (31). The volume also includes an English translation of the introduction which Orlík wrote for his ballad-book of 1899. The work is meant for the general reader rather than for the scholar. It is well done and should prove useful to those for whom it was intended.

K. M.

Eiré, Histoire d'Irlande. By CHARLES M. GARNIER. Aubier, éditions Montaigne. Paris, 1939. Pp. 270. 25 fr. This short history falls into 24 chapters, half of which are devoted to the 19th and 20th centuries. These are followed by a two-page bibliographical note. The author has given us a clear and reasonably accurate sketch of Irish history. He ends with the following statement (dated April 1939):

A présent un duel met aux prises les deux moitiés du monde: le totalitarisme . . . et l'humanisme démocratique . . . Les Irlandais d'Europe et leurs frères, répandus sur toute la terre, . . . sont prêts à collaborer à la lutte contre l'attaque possible, . . .

The attack was soon to take place, but the Irish, contrary to the author's expectations, did not prove ready to collaborate in the fight against totalitarian aggression.

K. M.

Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose. By SAMUEL K. WORKMAN. Princeton Studies in English, Vol. 18. Princeton, 1940. Pp. viii + 210. \$2.00. This doctoral dissertation is a superior piece of work. The author makes a close examination, "in whole or in part," of 38 translations made in the fifteenth century by 33 translators. He shows that "the fifteenth century writers produced more mature prose when translating than they did when independent." He infers that the influence of

translations had much to do with the development of English prose toward maturity in the course of the century; thus the more since most of the English prose works of the time were translations. The inference seems justifiable. The dissertation is to be commended, not only because it is a sound treatment of an important subject, but also because it makes interesting reading. Unluckily there are a good many misprints. A few slips in matters of detail may be mentioned: on p. 3, "two hundred years before" should read "eight hundred years before", on p. 30, the passage from Caxton's prologue to *Cathon* seems to have been misunderstood (as is pleonastic and *by cause* etc. is parallel to the preceding *if*-clause, with which it is coordinated by *and*); on p. 35, a dash after *erle* would clear up the construction of the sentence quoted; on p. 43, the generalization about "original English prose" should be qualified by adding "of the fifteenth century."

K. M.

Goethes Rede zum Shakespears Tag. Wiedergabe der Handschrift. Mit einem Geleitwort von ERNST BEUTLER. Weimar: Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1938. 8 pp. Ms. and 19 pp. text. Aside from the interest the facsimile of this beautiful and important manuscript may claim (which on its Odyssey came from Frankfurt to Düsseldorf, thence to Egypt, Berlin, Vienna, Bonn and finally returned to Frankfurt in 1905), the publication is welcome on account of the accompanying terse and enlightening investigation, in which Beutler, with many an insight drawn from the archives of the Goethe-Museum, traces Goethe's relation to Shakespeare and the inspiration he received from him. The analysis of the oration itself goes deeper than any I have hitherto seen.

E. F.

The Classical Ideal in German Literature. An Introduction and an Anthology. By R. HINTON THOMAS, M. A. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes (1939). Pp. 126. 5/-. The plan of this book, to illustrate the concept of classicism by readings on certain themes such as the Legacy of Greece, Laocoon, the Humanitarian Ideal, the Conception of the Poet etc. from Kant to Kleist is an excellent one and the selection is effective. But it would, in the opinion of the reviewer, have been still more successful if the long general introduction, surveying in 29 pages German literature from the 16th century to the end of the 18th, had been omitted and if the texts had been treated inductively. What benefit could a student derive from a digest which mentions such authors as

Paul Schede and Johann Roling unless he abstracted it from his own reading? English textbooks apparently suffer from the same traditional disease as ours, the unpedagogical striving for comprehensiveness. Yet, it must be said that we have no anthology that is as good as this one, which should be an incentive to our teachers to improve upon it.

E. F.

Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or. Par ALBERT FEUILLERAT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. 99. An attractively written, printed, and illustrated booklet devoted to Marie Daubrun (Brunaud), the actress who, between Jeanne Duval and Mme Sabatier, inspired several of Baudelaire's poems. According to M. F. these are: *l'Irréparable*, *Chant d'automne*, *A une Madone*, *Poison*, *Ciel brouillé*, *Causeuse*, *Chat* (the second), *Beau Navire*, *Invitation au voyage*. The last two had been supposed to be written under the influence of Jeanne. M. F. shows that B.'s fancy for Marie should not be dismissed as a momentary affair and that it had genuine importance in the history of his poetry.

H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

MONTAIGNE AND DEMOCRACY. The article in your November issue by Jean David on "Quelques Aspects démocratiques de la philosophie de Montaigne" is disquieting indeed. Montaigne, in his nearly infinite wisdom, was the fountain-head, both in England and France, of liberal tendencies. From these was developed a political form of government which we are still allowed to venerate under the name of democracy. But what must we think of a "democracy" sired by a Bossuet, defender of the divine right of kings, a Barrès to whom the Germans owe part at least of their anti-Semitism, a Péguy in whom this present "confusion" has its roots, and a Bernard Fay, writing in 1940 on the "Liquidation du dix-huitième siècle"? The outraged shades of another great Gascon, Montesquieu, protest against this strange hybrid (compagnon de l'âne et du canard de Bérénice?) which calls itself "illiberal democracy."

NORMAN L. TORREY

Columbia University

LA DÉMOCRATIE DE MONTAIGNE Que doit-on conclure des citations rapportées par M. David (*MLN.*, LVI, 485-92)? Qu'elles présentent "quelques aspects démocratiques dans la philosophie de Montaigne," ou, au contraire, et bien plutôt qu'elles révèlent en Montaigne un sceptique fidéiste, un relativiste? Montaigne se range du côté des hommes qui sont guidés dans la vie par les mœurs, les lois et la religion de leur pays, et se défient de la raison. Mais, parce que Montaigne se trouve ainsi porté à s'intéresser à l'art populaire et aux qualités qu'on rencontre dans le peuple, est-on fondé à conclure que c'est là une manifestation de son esprit "démocratique"? M. David rapproche Montaigne et Barrès; mais est-ce par souci de la "démocratie" que le député boulangiste qu'était Barrès à l'époque de Bérénice a parlé avec tendresse d'une petite fille du peuple? Et puis, peut-on parler de "la philosophie" de Montaigne, quand il faut bien convenir que Montaigne n'a jamais exprimé ses idées en un système lié? Sa pensée était bien trop souple, diverse et fuyante pour qu'on la saisisse facilement. "Il n'y a que les professeurs qui soient sûrs de le comprendre, parce que leur profession est de tout comprendre," a dit délicieusement A. France. Mais M. David s'intéresse aux problèmes actuels; il veut se poser en défenseur de la "démocratie" ou plutôt de "l'aristocratie dans la démocratie." Il cherche à trouver en Montaigne un allié. C'est pour cela que, faisant appel à M. Lucien Romier, il croit pouvoir déclarer que "Montaigne sépare la notion de privilège de l'idée d'aristocratie." L'exemple de M. David ne montre-t-il pas l'impossibilité qu'il y a à vouloir s'occuper des problèmes que soulèvent les questions de "démocratie" et de "libéralisme," quand on ne voit dans l'évolution des événements qu'un conflit d'idées? Devons-nous conclure, avec Albert Sorel, que "la philosophie intellectualiste est vraiment d'une incompétence radicale pour l'explication des grands mouvements historiques," qu'on ne peut comprendre la position de Montaigne, de Voltaire, ou de Montesquieu qu'en tenant compte d'autres aspects de leur pensée que les aspects purement intellectuels et littéraires? Rappelons la remarque d'Albert Mathiez: "Il faut beaucoup de bonne volonté et d'aveuglement pour trouver, comme l'ont écrit beaucoup d'historiens de la littérature, que Montesquieu a certainement une prédilection pour l'Etat démocratique. C'est exactement le contraire qui est la vérité." Ce qui est vrai de Montesquieu l'est-il de Montaigne?

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

FEBRUARY, 1942

Number 2

TENNYSON AND PERSIAN POETRY

Of the major English poets of the nineteenth century who had an acquaintance with Persian poetry, only Tennyson knew how to read Persian. This was one of the fruits of his friendship with the only man who has been able to bring the poetry of Persia into the main stream of English literature, Edward Fitzgerald. Tennyson's readings in Persian had an influence upon his poetic production which, though small, is deserving of notice.

Yet even before he came into first-hand contact with the poets of Persia, he gave evidence of having acquired some knowledge of them in the translations of Sir William Jones and his fellow Orientalists. A glance at some of the titles of the *Poems by Two Brothers*, and particularly at some of the footnotes to Alfred's contributions, will reveal his debt to these sources. His early acquaintance with Persia is manifest in the poem of that name, in which Xenophon and Sir William are equally laid under contribution for epithets. From the former Tennyson gets the fauna and flora of the country; from the latter, such a phrase as "blooming bower of Shiraz or of Ispahan."¹

This first phase of Tennyson's Orientalism is illustrated in the 1830 volume by "Recollections of the Arabian Nights." This poem is most certainly also a recollection of the translations of oriental, and notably Persian, poetry which had been providing the romantic poets with the materials for "The Curse of Kehama," "Lallah Rookh," and perhaps even "The Bride of Abydos." Take, as an example, these lines from the last stanza but one:

¹ For these otherwise not easily accessible poems I have used the Cambridge Edition of *The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, ed. W. J. Rolfe, Boston, 1898 ("Appendix"). The phrase is quoted from p. 761, lines 6-7. All other references will be to the six volume edition by Hallam, Lord Tennyson, N. Y., 1908.

Then stole I up, and trancedly,
 Gazed on the Persian girl alone,
 Serene with argent-lidded eyes
 Amorous, and lashes like to rays
 Of darkness, and a brow of pearl
 Tressed with redolent ebony,
 In many a dark delicious curl,
 Flowing beneath her rose-hued zone.

Compare the above with the following, selected at random from a translation of one of the odes of the Persian lyric poet Hafiz, who was the most popular of the oriental poets in those years:

Thy soft down and sweet mole of thy cheek,
 Eyes, and eye-brows, and stature my senses enchain, . . .
 On my memory thy locks leave a grateful perfume,
 Far more fragrant than jasmine's sweet scents.
 While I gaze, not one word can I speak.²

Without maintaining that Tennyson had read precisely this translation, I submit that he was drawing upon Persian poetry when he wrote the lines in question. Such descriptions of facial beauty are a staple of Persian poetry and were particularly exploited by the early translators whom Tennyson read.³ Arthur Hallam, in reviewing "Recollections of the Arabian Nights" in *The Englishman's Magazine*, assured the public that so far as Orientalism was concerned, "Our author knows what he is about"; therefore "let nobody expect a multifarious enumeration of Viziers, Barmecides, Fireworshippers and Cadis; trees that sing, horses that fly, and Goules that eat rice pudding!"⁴ That is, Tennyson was not relying upon the Arabian Nights entirely for his oriental touches; nor, for that matter, upon the exaggerated descriptions in the oriental tale of the eighteenth century—*Vathek*, for instance. In short, Tennyson had read Sir William Jones.

To this early fondness for Sir William's oriental researches might also be traced Tennyson's use of the Persian legend of the

² John Hindley, *Persian Lyrics, or Scattered Poems from the Diwan-i-Hafiz*, London, 1800, p. 74.

³ See Wallace C. Brown, "The Popularity of English Travel Books about the Near East, 1775-1825," *PQ*, xv (1936), 70; "English Travel Books and Minor Poetry about the Near East," *ibid.*, xvi (1937), 249; "Byron and English Interest in the Near East," *SP*, xxxiv (1937), 55; and "Prose Fiction and English Interest in the Near East," *PMLA*, lxxviii (1938), 827.

⁴ August, 1831, pp. 616 f.

gul u bulbul, or the rose and the nightingale, though he could have come upon it in Byron. At any rate, the poet learned the Persian word for nightingale early, and used it in the poem on the Arabian Nights:

The living airs of middle night
Died round the bulbul as he sung. (69-70)

Tennyson has followed the Persian legend in making the bird male, instead of female as she is in the Greek legend of Philomela. As W. J. Rolfe has pointed out, "it is only the male bird that sings"; therefore the Persian poets are more correct in their ornithology than the Greeks.⁵

Later, however, Tennyson vacillates between the two views of Philomela mourning for Itylus and the bulbul complaining of his unrequited love for the rose. In "The Gardener's Daughter" he has:

and the nightingale
Sang loud, as tho' he were the bird of day. (94-5)

On the other hand, in "The Palace of Art" he writes:

No nightingale delighted to prolong
Her low preamble all alone, (173-4)

and in "The Princess":

And all about us pealed the nightingale
Rapt in her song. (217-18)

But later in "The Princess" he returns to the Persian legend:

Not for thee . . .
O Bulbul, any rose of Gulistan
Shall burst her veil. (103-4)

This is the only instance where Tennyson seems to be conscious of the significance of his substitution of a Persian for a Greek (or an English) nightingale. In the manner of the Persian poets he has personified the rose as a female beloved who hides her true feelings behind the *pardah-i-ismal*, or veil of modesty. The famous eighth ode of Hafiz, for example, applies this phrase to the wife of Potiphar in the favorite tale of Joseph and Zuleikha:

I very well know from the daily increasing beauty which Joseph had,
That a resistless love tore away from Zuleikha the veil of her chastity.*

* Camb. Ed., p. 814, note to line 218.

* Hindley, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

But we have already gone by the year 1846, when apparently Tennyson began to read Persian poetry in the original. Edward B. Cowell, a friend of Fitzgerald's who throughout the forties and for some time thereafter was the chief English authority on Persian literature, in that year introduced Tennyson to the Persian language. There is not much more than Cowell's word for this (the *Memoir*, for instance, does not mention it) but the internal evidence from the poetry, as we shall see, supports the contention. Cowell testifies that Tennyson "took to Hafiz," whose odes he had been translating for the poet interlinearly. Later, he detected Tennyson's use of the form of the Persian *ghazal* or ode in "The Princess"; more particularly in one of the songs which were added in 1850.⁷

Apparently, Tennyson made but little progress with his Persian at this time, for eight years later (in 1854) he was hard at it again. For a fortnight, Fitzgerald tells us, he studied Persian with the poet at Farringford.⁸ A letter of Tennyson's to Forster at the time bears this out, as does Mrs. Tennyson's diary notation that her husband suffered from eye-trouble as a result of poring over the difficult script of a Persian grammar and the odes of Hafiz.⁹ A little later the same year Fitzgerald wrote to Tennyson that he was busy looking out for a Persian dictionary and a translation of the *Gulistan* for him, though he suspected Tennyson would not care for the latter.¹⁰ Aided by Sir William Jones' *Grammar*, Tennyson

⁷ George Cowell, *The Life and Letters of Edward Byles Cowell*, London, 1904, p. 373; Edward B. Cowell, "Jamī, the Persian Poet," *Fraser's Magazine*, LIX (Nov 1856), 603.

⁸ Hallam, Lord Tennyson, ed., *Tennyson and His Friends*, London, 1911, p. 106.

⁹ Alfred, Lord Tennyson, *A Memoir by His Son*, New York, 1898, I, 373-4.

¹⁰ *Tennyson and His Friends*, p. 107. This would seem to indicate that prior to 1854 Tennyson had not made the acquaintance of Saadi's famous book. Hence the parallel pointed out by Bradley (who in turn owes it to the Bishop of Derry) between the fifth stanza of poem xc in *In Memoriam* and a passage in the *Gulistan* of Saadi, may be entirely fortuitous. On the other hand it is possible that Tennyson came upon the particular apologue without having read the *Gulistan in toto*. The reference in "The Princess" to the "Rose of Gulistan" may similarly be taken to show familiarity with the Persian word for rose-garden, not necessarily with Saadi's book as W. J. Rolfe seems to believe it does (Cambridge Edition, "Notes," p. 818). At all events, if Tennyson did read the *Gulistan*, he does not particularly show its influence.

managed to get on pretty well with the odes of Hafiz. He apparently confided to Cowell the opinion that Hafiz was the most Persian of the Persian poets, a remark which Fitzgerald took to mean that he was "the best musician of words."¹¹ Something of this music and a little of the figurative language of Hafiz I believe is found in Tennyson's poetry of this and a later period. It will be my purpose now to trace this influence in a number of specific places.

A. The use of the *ghazal* form

Though the *ghazals* or odes of Hafiz had been popularized sufficiently in the earlier years of English Orientalism by Sir William Jones and others, only rarely had attempts been made to retain the original form.¹² Certainly the translations which Cowell himself had been making for the magazines were not *ghazals* in form.¹³ But that form, in the originals, was distinctive enough to catch the ear of a subtle poet like Tennyson when he read the Persian.

The *ghazal* may use a variety of meters but the rhyme scheme is always aa ba ca etc., for a number of couplets usually not less than five nor more than thirteen, into the last of which the poet generally weaves his own name. Frequently, though not always, a refrain is added to each rhyming line, which gives the effect in English of identical rhymes. A few lines from an ode of Hafiz rendered "isometrically" by Walter Leaf will clarify this:

Lo now, my heart to peace, as the years *roll*, attaineth not.
Turned all to blood for anguish, to health's *goal* attaineth not.

Dog-like in dust I lay me, the dust near thy dwelling place;
Flows forth my tear, and yet to a crust's *dole* attaineth not.

Woe's me, my soul for sake of my friend's heart aweary is;
What cheer for cheerless wight that the death-*roll* attaineth not...

Hafiz, be strong to bear; for in love's path what man so e'er
Dares not to yield his life, to the Soul's *Soul* attaineth not.¹⁴

For convenience I have italicized the rhyme-words. "Attaineth not" is of course not a rhyme but a refrain. The middle section

¹¹ *The Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Fitzgerald*, London, 1902-3, II, p. 61.

¹² See the prose paraphrases of John Hindley, *op. cit.*

¹³ For a full bibliography of Cowell's translations, see the appendix to his *Life and Letters*.

¹⁴ *Versions from Hafiz*, London, 1898, pp. 46-7.

of the famous song in *The Princess* which begins "Now sleeps the crimson petal," shows a similar form:

Now droops the milk-white peacock like a ghost,
And like a ghost she glimmers on to me.

Now lies the earth all Danaë to the stars,
And all thy heart lies open unto me.

Now slides the silent meteor on, and leaves
A shining furrow, as thy thoughts in me. (165-170)

The music of these lines, I believe, is quite unlike anything in English poetry before them, and it is very similar to the music of the *ghazal* even as rendered in English by Walter Leaf. To be sure, no attempt has been made to rhyme the lines or to introduce the poet's name, but the refrain in the second line of each couplet is unmistakably suggestive of the *ghazal*. It is easy to believe that Tennyson deliberately availed himself of this novel metrical form when one recalls how he was impressed by the meters of the Arabic poems, *The Moallakat*, which he imitated with great success in the Locksley poems.¹⁵ As we have seen, Cowell was also aware of the *ghazal* meter in the above song.

B. The figure of the "veil"

The last stanza of section LVI of *In Memoriam* has never been satisfactorily explained:

O Life as futile, then, as frail!
O for the voice to soothe and bless!
What hope of answer, or redress?
Behind the veil, behind the veil.

The last line is the troublesome one. A. C. Bradley says that "it is impossible to tell what metaphor was in the poet's mind," and then suggests that probably the veil in *Leviticus*, xvi, 2 and *Hebrews*, vi, 19-20 is being referred to; that is, the veil which shut off the "holy place."¹⁶ This view, it seems to me, is weak because it forces upon the imagination a material concept in an eminently mystical poem. James M. Dixon concurs in Bradley's view, but goes on to identify the Biblical veil with the veil in Fitzgerald's

¹⁵ *Memoir*, I, 195; II, 491.

¹⁶ *A Commentary on Tennyson's "In Memoriam,"* London, 1907 (2nd ed.), p. 153, note 28.

translation of Omar ("There was a veil past which I could not see," xxxii), tracing both back to the Tindall Bible.¹⁷ But Fitzgerald did not go to the Tindall Bible for his veil since it was to be found in the Persian quatrains which he was translating. However, *The Rubaiyat* itself could not have been the source for Tennyson's veil, since Fitzgerald was just beginning his Persian studies when *In Memoriam* came out. Tennyson must, therefore, have come upon the expression in Hafiz, or for that matter anywhere else in Persian poetry, where the phrase *pass-i-pardah* (behind the veil) is common, especially when used in the mystical sense of that which divides the known from the unknown. In Hafiz, for instance, we read, "How do you know behind the veil who is lovely and who is hateful?"

This is the sense, more or less, in which Tennyson again uses the phrase in "The Holy Grail" to describe Percival's momentary glimpse of the Grail:

And o'er his head the Holy Vessel hung
Redder than any rose, a joy to me,
For now I knew the veil had been withdrawn. (520-22)

C. The treatment of nature in *Maud*

Section xxii of Part I of *Maud*, that which begins "Come into the garden, Maud," is, I am persuaded, full of recollections of Persian poetry, especially the lyrical poetry of Hafiz, that "best musician of words." Let the reader compare with that noted section the following faithful translations of passages in Hafiz that Tennyson might very well have read in Persian:

Now the west wind, breathing odours, fills the fainting soul with bliss;
Truly, say I, every perfume from the fragrance—crowned is best.
Lo, the rose all busked for farewell, ere her veil yet scarce is drawn;
Wail, o bulbul, plead thy heart's need; sure the deep-drawn sound is best.
'Twas the lily's voice that warned me, 'twas the sweet-tongued lily-voice,
"In this outworn world of burdened souls the load light bound is best."
On the night-bird's wail a blessing! All along this path of love
Hearts are waking; yea, the wailing voice of wakers round is best.

For the garden longs my heart not, when thy radiance it discerneth;
As a cypress rooted resteth, as a branded tulip burneth.
For the hyacinth, I scorn her, that she dared to match thy ringlets;
What a puny worthless black thing, what an impudence she learneth!

¹⁷ *The Spiritual Meaning of "In Memoriam,"* New York, 1920, p. 54.

In the wilderness and dark night whither turn the erring footstep,
 But to where thy beauty radiant as a beacon burneth?
 With the taper meetly weep I in the dreary hour of dawning,
 For alike we sit consuming, and alike the Loved one spurneth
 In the garden walk and mark how, by the rose's throne, the tulip
 As a monarch's boon companion, his effulgent cup upturneth.¹⁸

Now these "catalogues of flowers," as they have been called, were the kind of poetry from Hafiz which Edward B. Cowell was mainly translating during those early years of his career. Therefore there is special reason to believe that these would be the poems which he and Fitzgerald would direct Tennyson's attention to at this time. The blowing musk, "the breeze of morning," "the planet of love," the waking bird, the personification of the roses and lilies, the comparison of the beloved to these, the plaintive and the boastful references to the distant beloved herself—these occur over and over again in the odes of Hafiz describing the gardens of Shiraz. References to nature may in themselves be the staple of poetry in whatever language, but the naturalism of this song from *Maud* is unlike anything in English, or for that matter, European poetry. The German philosopher Hegel has perhaps said the best thing on this point:

when we speak in our Poetry of Roses, Nightingales and Wine, it is done in a quite other and more prosaic sense the Rose is regarded as for ornament; we are "crowned with Roses"; or we hear the Nightingale and we sympathize with it; we drink Wine and we call it the Dispellor of Care . . . With the Persian poets, however, the Rose is not an image, or a symbol, or a mere ornament; but it actually appears to the Poet as animated with a Soul, as a loving Bride; and he penetrates with his spirit deep into the Soul of the Rose.¹⁹

Tennyson, incidentally, has a curious approximation of the last clause of this sentence of Hegel's in "And the soul of the rose went into my blood," which is striking for its apprehension of the spirit of Persian poetry as described by the philosopher.

D. The figure of the renascent dust

There is one other evidence in *Maud* of the influence of Persian poetry, and that is in the last stanza of the section referred to above:

¹⁸ Leaf, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 41.

¹⁹ Quoted by William Hastie, "Notes," *The Festival of Spring*, from the *Divan* of Jelalleddin, Glasgow, 1903.

She is coming, my own, my sweet;
 Were it ever so airy a tread,
 My heart would hear her and beat,
 Were it earth in an earthy bed;
 My dust would hear her and beat,
 Had I lain for a century dead,
 Would start and tremble under her feet,
 And blossom in purple and red. (916-23)

The last two lines are reminiscent of the noted quatrain in the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*:

I sometimes think that never blows so red
 The Rose as where some buried Caesar bled;
 That every Hyacinth the Garden wears
 Dropped in its lap from some once lovely Head

But we must again be careful to discount the influence of Omar at a time when he had not yet been translated by Fitzgerald and was therefore comparatively unknown in England. However, the whole passage, especially the figure of the renascent dust, is very Hafizian. Compare, for example, these lines as translated by Gertrude Lowthian Bell:

Where are the tidings of union? that I may arise—
 Forth from the dust I will rise up to welcome thee!

When to my grave thou turnest thy blessed feet,
 Wine and the lute shalt thou bring in thy hand to me,
 Thy voice shall ring through the folds of my winding-sheet
 And I will arise and dance to thy minstrelsy.²⁰

Here is another passage from Hafiz, also rendered by Miss Bell:

When I am dead, open my grave and see
 The cloud of smoke that rises round thy feet:
 In my dead heart the fire still burns for thee;
 Yea, the smoke rises from my winding-sheet.²¹

Tennyson appears to have been fond of the figure of the dust

²⁰ Quoted by Edward G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, 1928, III, 310.

²¹ *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz*, London, 1928, p. 134.

coming back into life, for some years later it reappeared in "The Ancient Sage":

O rose-tree planted in my grief,
And growing on her tomb,
Her dust is greening in your leaf,
Her blood is in your bloom (163-7)

But in that late year it is difficult not to believe that Tennyson was recalling the phrase already made famous by his friend, especially as "The Ancient Sage" was published in the same volume as "Tiresias" which Tennyson addressed to Fitzgerald.

J. D. YOHANNAN

College of the City of New York

NOTES ON *TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*, IV, 1397-1414

I

Whan he for fered out of Delphos sterte (IV, 1411).¹

This line appears not to accord precisely with Chaucer's previous accounts of Calchas' activities and calls to mind a difference between Chaucer's main sources, Boccaccio and Benoît. The seeming discord is interesting not only in itself but also because there is evidence that Chaucer was aware of its presence and took pains to resolve it. As he first wrote the line, it was so discordant as to be flatly contradictory, and for that original he substituted the line as it now stands. The discrepancy is now less noticeable; in fact almost indiscernible, as the silence of over five hundred years (certainly fifty years of intensive examination of the poem) would seem to witness.

At the beginning of *Troilus and Criseyde* we are told that there was dwelling in Troy "a lord of gret auctoritee" named Calchas, who knew

¹ *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde* by Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. R. K. Root (Princeton, 1926). All quotations are from this edition. The reading above is adopted by Robinson in the Cambridge text and also by the editors of the Globe text and by Skeat.

By answe're of his god, that highte thus,
Daun Phebus, or Appollo Delphicus (I, 69-70)

that Troy should be destroyed. When Calchas learned this,

He caste anon out of the town to go

For which, for to departen softly
Took purpos ful this for-knowynge wise,
And to the Grekes oost ful pryvely
He stal anon. . . . (I, 75, 78-81) ²

After Hector's assurance of security to Criseyde, we hear no more of Calchas till the beginning of Book iv. Here, in the course of his plea for the exchange of Criseyde, Calchas tells the Greeks that he grieves because he left his daughter behind,

Slepyng at hom, whan out of Troie I sterte;
O sterne, O cruel fader that I was!
How myghte I have in that so harde an herte?
Allas! I ne hadde ibrought hire in hire sherte! (iv, 93-96)

From these two passages we definitely learn that Calchas, convinced of the city's doom, left *Troy* and fled to the Grecian Camp. This is the general outline of events which Chaucer took from the *Filostrato*, and he did not alter it in any essential detail.³

Not quite in accord with this version of the story, however, is the statement made by Criseyde in the course of her discussion with Troilus on their last night together. After she has told Troilus of the various devices by which she will persuade Calchas to allow her to return to Troy, Criseyde continues, in a passage which has no counterpart in the *Filostrato*:

And if he [Calchas] wolde aught by his sort it preve,
If that I lye, in certain I shal fonde
Destourben hym, and plukke hym by the sleve,
Makyng his sort, and beren hym on honde,
He hath nat wel the goddes understonde.
For goddes speken in amphibologies,
And, for a soth, they tellen twenty lyes.

² The account of Calchas' desertion is given in I, 64-98. We are also told of the disturbance which "up ros whan it was first aspied. . . . That Calkas traitour fled was."

³ See *The Filostrato of Giovanni Boccaccio*, trans. N. E. Griffin and A. B. Myrick (Philadelphia, 1929), I, 8-11 and iv, 7-8.

Ek drede fond first goddes, I suppose,—
 Thus shal I seyn,—and that his coward herte
 Made hym amys the goddes text to glose,
 Whan he for fered out of Delphos sterte. (iv, 1401-11)

To what episode is Criseyde referring in the last three lines? It is quite clear that the "text" referred to must be the oracle which lead Calchas to believe that Troy was doomed. But when did Calchas visit Delphi? No mention has previously been made of the visit—except such a hint as may possibly be inherent in the phrase "Apollo Delphicus."

To find an answer to these questions we must turn to Benoit's account of Calchas' desertion. According to the *Roman de Troie* Calchas was sent to Delphi by the Trojans to ask Apollo for his favour and advice. The oracle told Calchas that he was to go straight to the Grecian fleet and to use his wisdom to help the Greeks; for it was the god's will that Troy should be destroyed. This decree Calchas obeyed.⁴ The variant reading of the H₂ manuscript shows clearly that the line in question refers to the episode related by Benoit:

Whan he from Delphos to the Grekys sterte.⁵

Now, according to Professor R. K. Root, "after line 299 of Book iv, H₂ becomes an α MS; and between line 1301 and line 1442 gives a number of unique readings, some of which appear to represent Chaucer's text in its earliest state."⁶ If this is the case, then we may see in the changing of this line evidence that Chaucer was aware of a discrepancy between his own previous account derived

⁴ See *Le Roman de Troie*, ed. L. Constans (Paris, 1904-1912), 5817-5927. Root notes that the reference is to Benoit's account, of which he gives a summary (note on iv, 1411, p. 524); but he does not comment upon its variance with Chaucer's previous account.

⁵ From the textual variants given by Root at the foot of p. 300 of his edition.

⁶ Notes in Root, *op. cit.*, p. 502. See also, *Introduction*, p. lvi, where Root says: "In its α portion, H₂ represents the text at a stage not far removed from that found in Ph. . . . In 4.1301-442, H₂ has a series of unique readings which seem to represent a stage more primitive than that of Ph. . . . Its chief value lies in its testimony to an early stage of α in Book iv." For instances of Chaucer's revision of the H₂ MS to correct errors which Boccaccio made in following Benoit, see Root's notes on iv, 50-54, 57-58, and 137-138. In connection with the last note, see the H₂ variant for line 138.

from Boccaccio⁷ and Criseyde's statement derived from Benoit.⁸ He would notice that his readers, whether they knew Benoit or not, might be puzzled by the line

Whan he from Delphos to the Grekys sterte.

For it clearly refers to the desertion and equally clearly differs from the account previously given. But the revised line,

Whan he for fered out of Delphos sterte,

offers no *necessary* contradiction. It allows all readers to suppose that Calchas went to Delphi, returned to Troy, and then fled to the Greeks⁹—a supposition, by the way, which they must make if Chaucer is to be thought consistent. As for the reader who knew Benoit, though he might notice that Chaucer's previous account of Calchas differed from the account in the *Roman de Troie*, nevertheless he could simply suppose Chaucer to be following another "auctoritee." He would not be compelled to suppose that the revised line had any necessary reference to Benoit, despite the consultation of the oracle common to both accounts.

It might well be asked at this point why Chaucer did not remove even the possible suspicion of inconsistency. It would have been as simple and as metrically sound to have changed the line to

Whan he for fered to the Grekys sterte.

Such a change would have removed the contradiction caused by the H₃ reading, and at the same time it could not arouse any suspicion as Chaucer's revision might.

An answer to this question is readily suggested. At this point

⁷ Boccaccio's reason for changing Benoit's account would probably be that he felt such an episode to be extraneous to the story of the lovers. He was not concerned with the history of Troy and he omitted all material irrelevant to the love story proper.

⁸ We must note that Root's judgement as to the sequence of the textual revisions of the *Troilus* receives confirmation from the two readings. For if the H₃ MS reading were a final revision, then we should have to believe that Chaucer, in revising the line, made its discrepancy more glaring. Manifestly, it is impossible to believe that he would do this.

⁹ Any reader so curious as to question this line would, either by memory or by reference, note that Calchas knew of the doom "by answeere of his god, that highte thus, Daun Phebus or Apollo *Delphicus*." This naming of Apollo which calls to mind the famous shrine is not in Boccaccio (see *Fil.* 1, 8), and it would give some substantiation to the view which I suggest the curious reader would take.

in her speech Criseyde is scoffing at the occult practices of the seer. And a reference to Delphi, the most famous of the oracles, is therefore apposite. But the reference has a greater importance than mere harmony with its context. Criseyde reveals here—for the first time, it may be noted—that she knows fully and exactly why Calchas fled from Troy. But she refuses to treat his reason seriously because she doubts, and may always have doubted, the validity of the oracles themselves—

For goddes spoken in amphibologies

And, for a soth, they tellen twenty lyes. (iv, 1406-07)

To Criseyde, her father's flight illustrates the deceit of the oracles, who delude men by making them interpret the "amphibologies" to accord with their own fears. It is for the reader the very example which proves that the oracles do enable men to read the future truly. The single word "Delphos" forcibly calls to mind the supernatural means by which the knowledge of Troy's destruction has been imparted to Calchas. On the other hand, the reference to the god's utterance in our suggested line,

Whan he for fered to the Grekys sterte,

would be ineffectively vague. The definite mention of Delphi sharply points the irony of Criseyde's ridicule of the oracles.

II

The ironic function of the word "Delphos" raises the larger issue of Chaucer's purpose in portraying Criseyde as skeptical of the powers of the gods.¹⁰ In Boccaccio Criseida is not so portrayed. And the "skepticism" of her successor owes its existence to Chaucer's addition of the passage (iv, 1397-1414) which contains the line we have been discussing.

Both Boccaccio and Chaucer say that Calchas, fleeing from Troy,

. . . left in this meschaunce,

Al unwist of this fals and wikked dede,

His doughter. . . . (i, 93-95)¹¹

Only in Chaucer does the heroine ever reveal that she knows the cause of her father's desertion. Information like this becomes definitely important at the point in both narratives where the

¹⁰ Kittredge has commented upon Criseyde's skepticism but in a rather different connection. See *Chaucer and his Poetry* (Harvard, 1915), 135-136.

¹¹ See *Filosofo*, i, 11.

heroine is planning her return to Troy. For if, in either case, she should know why her father has fled and *if she should consider his reasons seriously*, then she would never propose the plans which actually are proposed.

Boccaccio's Criseida does *not* consider why her father has left Troy, and apparently the reader is to conclude that she does not know her father's motive. Chaucer, however, deals with the problem in a fuller and more credible way. Criseyde does know why her father has left Troy. She does know of his belief that Troy must fall. But, in the very passage which reveals her knowledge, Criseyde scoffs at the means which have lead Calchas to such a belief. It is her opinion, as we have seen, that the oracles fool men and that her father's desertion is an example of the way in which diviners read their own fears into the "amphibologies" of the gods.

Readers of Boccaccio may not find it incredible that Criseida should be ignorant of her father's reasons for desertion. It is easy to accept the ignorance because it is never specifically stated by the poet, but remains a tacit assumption—an assumption, however, which the reader must make if he is to explain reasonably how Criseida comes to make such futile plans. However this may be, there can be no doubt that Chaucer bases Criseyde's fatal error upon a forthright skepticism—reasonably founded on a well-known habit of the gods—and thereby gives to her actions a greater credibility. It is far easier to believe that the daughter of a priest would realize why her father had left Troy than to believe that she has not the slightest inkling of the cause. At the same time, the cancelling of Criseyde's knowledge by her skepticism enables Chaucer to make the plans for return to Troy more detailed and more convincing (to Criseyde and to Troilus) than those of Criseida. In consequence, he is able to expose more fully than Boccaccio their complete futility. There is no danger that the reader will feel incredulous about Criseyde's planning, as he might feel in reading Boccaccio. For the one point which in Boccaccio might tax his powers of acceptance—the question of the heroine's ignorance—is here adequately dealt with by Chaucer's addition. The double revelation of Criseyde's knowledge and skepticism makes it completely credible that she could plan her return in contempt of the gods. In short, the irony conveyed by the word "Delphos" is only part of the larger irony which Chaucer effects by the addition of the whole passage.

ELIZABETHAN *CHE VORE YE* 'I WARRANT YOU'

Trying to protect his blind, old father, the Earl of Gloucester, from Oswald the Steward, Edgar, disguised as a peasant, challenges his adversary in the following terms (*King Lear*, Act iv, Sc. 6, ll. 245-46):

Keep out, *che vore ye*, or Ise try whether your costard or my ballow be the harder. Chill be plain with you.

As rightly pointed out by G. L. Kittredge in his recent edition of *King Lear* (Boston, 1940, p. 219) the conventional form of rustic speech assumed by Edgar accords well enough with the dialect of Somersetshire. Yet the translation of *che vore ye* as 'I warn ye' (*ibid.* p. 220) is hardly adequate. Ever since Johnson's edition of Shakespeare, *vor(e)* has been interpreted in the same way, viz. as a dialectal form of *warn* 'to caution,' although E. Eckhardt¹ appears to have some doubts about the correctness of this interpretation. It is strange, indeed, that Shakespearean scholars have overlooked the contemporary translation of *che vore ye* given by Alexander Gill under *chi vor yi* in his *Logonomia Anglica* (1621),² in spite of the fact that in their comments on *che* they occasionally refer to Gill's account of the southern dialects in the same work. Nor is any translation attempted in *NED.*, where the phrase is only mentioned under *Che* and *I* (as an example of *che*).

Among the peculiarities of southern English Gill³ mentions the following "substitutions":

Pro s. substituent z. vt zing pro sing cano: & Ich, pro J ego: cham, pro J am sum: chil, pro J wil volo. chi vör yi, pro J warant you, certum do.

Gill's *chi vör yi* is obviously identical with Shakespeare's *che vore ye*, which should therefore be rendered 'I warrant (you)' and not 'I warn you.' *Che* (*chi*) is a new stressed variant of 'ch, the proclitic form of the south-western *ich* 'I' as in *cham* 'I am,' *chill*

¹ *Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas*, Louvain, 1910-11, p. 68.

² O. L. Juriczek's ed. in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker*, 90. Heft, Strassburg i. El., 1903.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

'I will' (cf. *Lear* and Gill above), while *vore* (*vor*)⁴ stands for *warn*, dialectal contraction of the verb 'to warrant.' *Che vore ye* evidently enjoyed a certain popularity as a shibboleth of rusticity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for we find it frequently in the mouths of dialect speakers in the early drama. The earliest instance so far known occurs in *The Arbor of Amity* (1568) by Th. Howell, who was probably a native of Dunster in Somersetshire (*DNB.*):

For once ich went, up into Kent,
with the headman of our Towne:
Where ich did waite, at every baite,
*chee vore the cham no clowne*⁵

The anonymous morality, *The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality* (1600)⁶ has the following instances:

(Tenacitie) Yoo by gisse, sir, tis high time *che vore ye*,
Cham averd another will ha'te afore me.
(Vanitie) . . . What will you give me?
(Tenacitie) *Cha vore thee*, sonne, do rid me quickly hence,
Chill giue thee a vaire peece of threehalpence.

The pseudo-Shakesperean comedy *The London Prodigall* (1605)⁷ makes frequent use of the phrase:

chill make him for capyring any more, *chy vor thee* (II. 4. 57-58);
no, *chy vor you*: zyrria, chil come (II. 4. 73-74);
(Lanc.) . . . Now, gentle sonne, let me knowe the place.
(Olyver) No, *chy vore you* (II. 4. 79-80);
Is a zitch a voxer? chill looke to his water, *che vor hum* (III. 3. 43);
Well, *che vor ye*, he is changed (V. 1. 349);
and you shall not want for vortie more, I *che vor thee* (V. 1. 354-55).

One instance occurs in Ben Jonson's comedy *A Tale of a Tub* (1633):⁸

Let 'hun mend his manners then, and know his betters:
It's all I aske 'hun: and 'twill be his owne;
And's Masters too, another day. *Che vore 'hun.*

⁴ Gill's *ö* denotes the equivalent of ME *ō* in *köl*, *pöl* (coal, pole).

⁵ *The Poems of Thomas Howell (1568-1581)*, ed. by Alexander B. Grosart, Manchester, 1879, p. 90.

⁶ Malone Society Reprints, 1913, ll. 345 f., 355-57.

⁷ C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, Oxford, 1908.

⁸ Ed. by Florence M. Snell, London, 1915, II. 2. 68-70.

These examples prove the correctness of Gill's translation, although admittedly the context in which the quotation from *King Lear* occurs might at first sight seem to favor the interpretation 'I warn.' It is, of course, possible that Shakespeare had misunderstood the phrase and actually employed it in the sense of 'I warn,' but I am more inclined to think that he simply inserted it here as a kind of colorful expletive without bothering much about the meaning, merely using it as a stock expression of the sixteenth century stage peasant to produce a certain effect. In this instance he could do so with impunity because *che vore ye* had apparently lost much of its primary sense even at that time. We may compare the use of *I warrant* in "Now, what's the matter? some brawle toward, *I warrant you*," and "*Ile warrant you*; goe, get you in," both from *The London Prodigall* (II. 4. 94-95 and III. 2. 5), as well as the vagueness of the modern Somerset expression *I'll warn ee* (see below). At any rate *I warrant (you)* has been in vogue for centuries (cf. *NED* under *warrant*, vb., 4, 'to guarantee as true') in the meaning 'I'll be bound,' and it is a noteworthy fact that in *The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality* (l. 800) we find the pseudo-dialectal variant *che warrant thee*; the dissyllabic form *warrant* is doubtless a metrical makeshift here, for the whole line runs: "Shalt not need man, chill keepe him safe, *che warrant thee*." A similar case occurs in Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pithias* (1571):⁹

(Wyll) Wyll no man speake for them in this wofull case?

(Grimme) No *chill warrant you*, one maister Stippus is in place, . . .

Having established the equation between *vore* and *warrant* we are still confronted with the problem of accounting for the curtailed form *vor(e)* as against the far more ordinary dialect reduction *warn*. In a number of English dialects *warrant* has undergone various reductions, resulting in *warnt*, *warnd*, *warn*, etc. Thus *warn* seems to be the current form in Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon, western Somerset, etc., whereas *warnt* has been recorded from Essex, Surrey, the Isle of Wight, etc., and *warnd* from Hampshire, Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon and the Isle of Wight (*EDD* and *EDGr* under *warrant*). According to F. T. Elworthy,¹⁰ *warn* for *warrant*

⁹ *A Select Collection of Old Plays*, ed. by J. P. Collier, London, 1825, I. 236.

¹⁰ F. T. Elworthy, *The West Somerset Word-Book*, London, 1886 (EDS, Ser. C.), p. 819.

is a "most common asseveration tacked on to almost any sentence" in the western Somerset dialect, e. g. "He on't come aneast the place, *I'll warn un*," and "*I'll warn ee* we be gwain to zee a change" (in the weather). From Surrey comes the following quotation: "It 'ull be a hard winter for the poor, *I'll warn't ye*," and from Dorset. "*I'll warn* that she's a witch" (EDD). The spelling *vor(e)* must represent a further reduction of the dialectal *warn* < *warrant* with the same loss of *n* as in *ire* for *iron*, a pronunciation used not only in eastern and western Somerset and eastern Devon (EDGr, Index) but also in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight;¹¹ according to Wright (EDGr § 271), final unstressed *n* has often disappeared in the south-western dialects. The occurrence of *v* for initial *w* is, however, a more intricate problem. Eckhardt¹² explains it as due to the influence of vulgar speech, which in those days is said to have exhibited an interchange of *v* and *w*. In an earlier paper¹³ I have pointed out that this explanation would imply either that the dialectal *warn* < *warrant* had found its way also into London speech, where its *w* was replaced by *v*, and that the new form **vor(n)* was adopted by southwesterners or deliberately introduced into their speech by the authors of the above dramas. Alternatively Eckhardt's words may simply mean that these authors touched up the dialect by substituting the vulgar *v* for the dialectal *w*. But, we may argue, if this incorrect use of *v* was deliberate for the purpose of creating a certain effect, how is it that we only come across it in the dialectal phrase *che vor(e) ye*? For the only other instance, *ivin*, which Eckhardt adduces and which, with some hesitation, he interprets as *I ween*, should be read *yvine* and is actually a rendering of *in fine*.¹⁴ And in the former case, if *vor(e)* were an early cockneyism, why is it only used by characters whose speech has in other respects a marked southern or southwestern flavor? Eckhardt's suggestion, therefore, does not seem to be particularly well founded. The only reasonable alternative I can offer is that *vor(e)* is as good dialect as, for instance, *che*.

¹¹ Cf. W. H. Long, *A Dictionary of the Isle of Wight Dialect*, London, 1886, p. 30, and W. H. Cope, *A Glossary of Hampshire Words and Phrases*, London, 1883 (EDS, Ser. C.), p. 47.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹³ "Alexander Gill (1621) on the Dialects of South and East England," *Studia Neophilologica* XI (1938/9), pp. 277-88.

¹⁴ Cf. Tucker Brooke's notes to *The London Prodigall*, p. 427.

This is a suggestion¹⁵ which involves the assumption that *v* could once replace initial *w* in the southern dialects, despite the complete absence of any trace of such a substitution in these dialects to-day. On the other hand we know that in the east and south-east of England the change of initial *v* to *w* has, for centuries, been a regular feature of dialectal speech. Hence it would not be in the least surprising to find here, during some period, the reverse tendency in operation. As a matter of fact a good many early spellings unmistakably indicate that the etymological distinction between initial *v* and *w* was on the point of being completely obliterated in these areas, for both are frequently used indiscriminately.¹⁶ The place-name evidence is also significant in this respect. It is true that the cases of *w* for *v* predominate, and that even secondary *v* < original *f* could be affected, e.g. *Warish Hall* (Essex): *Sancti Walerici de Takely* 1236, named after Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme; *Whipp's Cross* (Essex): *Phypp(y)s Cross(e)* 1517;¹⁷ *Wolvens Fm* (Surrey): *Fulefenne* 1241;¹⁸ *Vittlefield* (Isle of Wight): *Wythireyfeud* 13th c., *Vicarage Copse* (ibid.): *Wykeris* 1462,¹⁹ but examples of *v* for original *w* are by no means lacking. *Valdoo* (Sussex) is a case in point; it occurs as *silva voc. Waldey* 1492 and is to be derived from OE *weald* + *gehæg*. Similarly *Views Wood* (Sussex) is spelt *Whynes* 1631 and *Whiews* 1732.²⁰ In Kent we have *Valleys Shaw*, which is perhaps to be connected with *Aug. Waleys* 1346, and in particular *Venson Fm*, which appears as *Wendleston* in 1254.²¹ Even as far west as Devon we find *Vellacott* spelt *Wyluncote* 1333, and *Flankwell* written *Wlaunkewill* 1244.²² Hence we need not hesitate to assume that in these dialects *v* could more or less frequently replace an original *w*, and that *vor(e)* is an instance of this substitution. Its survival

¹⁵ The following paragraph is based essentially on pp. 283-84 of my paper "Alexander Gill (1621) on the Dialects of South and East England" (cf. footnote 13 above).

¹⁶ Cf. R. Jordan, *Handbuch der mittellenglischen Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1925, § 300.

¹⁷ *PN Essex*, pp. 535, 103.

¹⁸ *PN Surrey*, p. 251.

¹⁹ H. Kokeritz, *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight*, Uppsala, 1941, pp. 86, 248

²⁰ *PN Sussex*, pp. 78, 392.

²¹ *PN Kent*, pp. 47, 581.

²² *PN Devon*, pp. 123, 253.

was very likely due to the fact that it formed part of a set phrase, which catching the fancy of the early playwrights, has been, thanks to them, handed down to us as a rare but important case of a sporadic sound-change, whose effects are now discernible only in a few place-names.²³

HELGE KÓKERITZ

University of Minnesota

CHEZ VANDAMME SONT VENUS

M. J. L. Vaganay (*Neuphil. Mitt.* XL, 376) explique cette tournure syntaxique usuelle à Dunkerque par un picardisme (*ches* étant l'article en picard, équivalant étymologiquement à *ces*), qui, dans l'esprit de ces Flamands de France, se transposerait en *chez* (dans *je suis allé chez, je viens de chez V.*): "mais un pareil emploi de 'chez' serait tout à fait inexplicable." Je pense au contraire que *chez V. sont venus* contient à l'origine la préposition et que l'interprétation de M. Vaganay dénote une transposition, dans l'esprit des Dunkerquois, en *ches* = *ces* 'les.' La syntaxe de cette phrase est en effet répandue en dehors de territoires limitrophes du picard, c'est à dire de l'aire où l'article du pluriel est *ches*: Pierrehumbert, *Dict. hist. d. parler neuchâtelois*, s. v. *chez*, n° 2, écrit:

²³ Apropos of Shakespeare and English dialects I cannot resist this opportunity to warn the reader against the grotesque analysis of the speech of the Warwickshire worthies of Shakespeare's time in Edgar I. Fripp's *Shakespeare, Man and Artist*, London, 1938 (I, pp 27-29), where we find ourselves suddenly transported into the realm of early nineteenth century linguistics. Fripp tells us that the speech of these worthies "was nearer to that of Chaucer than to that of Doctor Johnson, nearer to the Saxon, the Norman, and the Latin (medieval and classical) than in the days of the lexicographer . . . and very much closer than to-day" This statement is illustrated by such spellings as *auncient*, *coosin*, *inchaunt*, *marchant*, *vertue*, etc., and we are further informed that Shakespeare's fellow-countrymen "added weight to the terms of both native and foreign origin, by supplementing *g* with a *d*—as in *alledge* (L *allegare*), *chardge* (F. *charge*)," etc., that "they strengthened their *h*'s rather than dropped them as in *whote* (hot), *whood* (hood), *whome* (home)," etc. There is perhaps no better justification—if indeed justification be still needed—for the painstaking work of the philologist than a perusal of Fripp's naïve observations on Elizabethan English.

Chez suivi d'un pron. pers. ou d'un nom de personne = la famille, la parenté, les parents de "Ce jardin, c'est à chez vous" "Voici une lettre pour chez vous" "Je m'en vais promener avec chez eux" (à nous, pour vous, avec eux, pourraient suffire). "J'irais bien, mais chez nous n'^{me} permettent pas" "Chez M Dubois sont arrivés hier; chez mon oncle les ont reçus." "Nous travaillons pour chez M Moser; ce sont des braves gens, chez M. Moser" . . —Stapfer, *Récréat.* 135, note la même expression en Charente: "Chez M Lavallée vendangeront . . ."

et donne à l'historique les passages suivants:

1585: Les femmes de chez Othemim Gérard . . .

1700: (J. Sandoz): J'envoyai Essayelet demander un fromage à chez mon oncle

1793: . . . la maison où chez mon beau père demeuroient.

Meyer-Lübke, *GRM* I, 138 a signalé la tournure canadienne *chez Jean sont venu* [sic'] *nous voir* 'les gens de chez Jean, sa famille'—il ne s'est pas douté que ce trait dialectal s'ajoute aux autres, énumérés par lui, qui rattachent le Canada aux patois de l'Ouest de la France. Enfin A. Thérive, "Querelles de langage" I, 112 cite, à côté d'un lorrain *Hubert* [= les Hubert] *sont venus me voir*, l'emploi courant en Limousin: *Chez Dupuy sont venus me voir*. Voilà donc une aire assez vaste qui, je suppose, pourrait être agrandie encore par des connaissances plus détaillées des parlers populaires de la France.

Stapfer et Thérive ont bien vu que *chez* avait à l'origine un sens fort, celui de 'maison' (*casa*). M. Dauzat, "Les noms de lieux," p. 167, a montré que les domaines ruraux nouvellement formés (à partir du XVI^e s.) pouvaient être nommés soit d'après le nom du possesseur avec un suffixe (*La Ménardièrre*, type aujourd'hui désuet), soit par des collectifs du type *les Meillels*, *les Michauds*, *les Rebouls* (Bourbonnais, Savoie, Languedoc), soit par le type *Chez Joffroy*, *Chez Planche*—dans les Charentes et en Savoie, c'est à dire dans précisément la même aire qui connaît aussi le phénomène syntaxique qui nous occupe. Sur l'histoire de ce *casa* cf. encore de Chambure, *Gloss. du Morvan*, s. v. *chez*, et Elise Richter, *ZRPh* XXXI, 571 seq. (particulièrement sur les noms propres comme *Chez-les-Grimaud* et sur les prépositions a. fr. *en ches*, *a ches*, plus récemment *vers chez*). A comparer aussi les noms de lieux provençaux du type *cò de Pons* (Mistral), litt. 'chez Pons' (= *eccu hoc* 'ce qui appartient à Pons').

On voit par les exemples historiques que l'emploi 'pléonastique,'

comme dans *demandeur un fromage à chez mon oncle*, s'explique par une sorte de respect de la sphère¹ de quelqu'un, cette ambiance s'incarnant dans sa maison; demander le fromage à mon oncle, ce serait le demander à lui-même, à *chez* . . . c'est s'adresser à sa maison—et même si en fait on venait à demander la chose au personnage même, on feint de ne pas l'impliquer personnellement (cf. *les pour chez nous, devant chez nous*, dans Molière, traduits 'notre, votre maison' par Lavet). L'impersonnalité de la 'maison' vis-à-vis de la personne du propriétaire expliquera aussi l'emploi de *chez* + nom de personne au lieu de 'la famille de . . . , les . . .': *chez Vandamme sont venus, chez M. Dubois sont arrivés hier* attire (à l'origine) l'attention loin des personnes individuelles, vers une vague idée d'une unité de la famille symbolisée par la maison (ou vers le faible reste de cette notion): il faut se rendre compte que dans *ce sont des braves gens, chez M. Moser* le sujet parlant n'exprime pas encore l'idée que 'les Moser' sont de braves gens, mais que 'dans la maison de Moser' il y a de braves gens—toujours est-il que la première de ces idées est à proximité, et l'équivalence de *chez M. Moser* et *les Moser* rend possible les tournures du type *chez Vandamme sont venus*, qui retient pourtant un peu de l'idée 'des gens de chez V.' On pourrait aussi admettre un croisement: *chez M. Lavallée vendangeront* = *chez M. L. il y aura des vendanges* + [*les gens de M. L.*] *vendangeront*, où la raison du croisement—puisqu'aussi bien il en faut une pour toute faute—serait l'avantage de retenir les deux idées: celle d'une activité émanant de la famille, de l'ambiance de M. L. + celle d'un lieu où cette activité se passe, les deux phrases incontaminées supprimant l'une de ces deux idées. On voit la même démarche de la pensée dans la phrase viennoise que j'ai citée *Arch. rom.* ix, 137: *Beim Wotruba ziağ'n's aus* = *bei dem W.* [= *Herrn W.*] *ziehen sie* [= *zieht man*] *aus*.

D'autre part, *chez* avec son sens rudimentaire de 'maison' comporte une nuance d'intimité ou d'aisance: quiconque consulte la

¹ C'est ce respect qui explique le (e)n = *domine* de noms de domaines ruraux à Majorque comme *Can Vincen* (= *ca En V.* 'la maison de M. Vincen'), *Son Vincen* (*so* [= *ecce hoc* 'ce qui appartient à'] *En V.*), v. la *Festschrift* pour Vossler "Idealistische Neuphilologie," p. 127 et *Lbl.* 1930, col. 129.—Le REW s. v. *casa* cite des formes rétoromanes (sursilvaines) 'à ma maison,' 'en bas vers la maison,' 'en haut vers leur maison' au sens de 'chez, vers moi, toi, eux'—l'identification de la maison et de son possesseur est devenue complète.

carte de l'Atlas linguistique *chez nous* constatera combien la nuance de 'maison' est encore latente dans *chez*, puisque tant de patois remplacent *chez nous* par un *à la maison* ou *à notre maison* plus explicites (cf. la phrase d'une cuisinière: *On naît esclave. Il est venu dans la maison ici en quittant de chez un vieux maître*, citée par moi *Arch. rom.* IX, 138): le *chez soi* est l'équivalent des *home*, *Heim* germaniques et la conception du *my home is my castle* transparaît encore dans des locutions comme *to feel at home somewhere*, *zu Hause sein in etwas*, dit de la familiarité avec un sujet; Anjou *être ben de chez soi* 'être personnellement à l'aise, avoir du bien de famille'; ou dans l'expression *celle de chez nous* sur la carte *ma femme* (points de l'Ouest., 513, 514, 517), litt. 'la maîtresse de notre maison' (avec ce *celle de* périphrase nominale comme *celles de Paris* = *les Parisiennes*, dont traite Brunot, "La pensée et la langue," p. 457). La nuance d'intimité et d'aisance expliquera particulièrement un *chez l'hôte* sur la carte *auberge* (noté "vieilli" au point 71, en Suisse romande) alternant avec *cabaret*. *Chez l'hôte*, pouvant fonctionner comme sujet ou régime d'une phrase, représente la même innovation syntaxique que *chez Vandamme sont venus*:² l'auberge, le cabaret sont des entités impersonnelles, *chez l'hôte* fait apparaître ces lieux comme l'ambiance d'un personnage où l'hôte vous accueille pour ainsi dire personnellement 'à sa maison,' 'à son *home*.' A noter que 'maison' s'emploie aujourd'hui dans tant de langues européennes pour *home*, alors qu'il s'agit d'appartements, voire de chambres—de la notion du 'château'

² Cf. pour l'accord avec un mot collectif qui a été la victime d'une ellipse un tour dialectal allemand: *des alten Wirts* [sc Leute, Familie] *haben heuer eine Magd* (Schiepek, "Der Satzbau der Egerlander Mundart," p 336, ce qui équivaldrait à un *τὸ τοῦ δεδασκάλου*), construit avec pluriel. Behaghel, "Deutsche Syntax" I, 360 explique *die Buddenbrooks* 'la famille B.', *Meyers* 'la famille M.' (en all. méridional *s'Meyers*) ainsi que les tournures prépositionnelles *bei Meyers*, *ins Schmidts* par l'ellipse de *Haus* auprès du nom propre au génitif: ('s) *Meyers sind gekommen* est donc jusqu'à un certain degré parallèle à *Chez Vandamme sont venus* = 'la maison de V.' De même *ein Gruss von s Meyers*, *er geht zu Scherers* sont apparentés à *de chez*, à *chez* dans les exemples suisses romands. Là aussi une interprétation erronée a lieu sous l'influence de pluriels bas-allemands qui se sont répandus dans toute l'Allemagne (*Kerls*, *Jungens* etc.): on sent *Meyers*, non pas comme le génitif que c'était à l'origine, mais comme un pluriel: 'les Meyer.' Mais une analogie littéralement correspondante au *chez Vandamme* . . . a été citée par Meyer-Lubke, l. c.: le haut autrichien *bei Schrutka hatten vergangenenes Jahr diese Wohnung gemietet*.

subsiste, malgré la disparition des manoirs féodaux, l'intimité de l'existence privée, pour le dire avec le terme des mystiques: le château de l'Âme. On sait de reste que ce *chez*, 'intime' et probablement paysan à l'origine, apparaît sur tant d'enseignes de bars, de dancings, de restaurants urbains—en France et en Amérique (où le type de restaurant *chez Michaut* indique un 'restaurant français'; à New York il y a une association des restaurants "Chez").

En italien, où le type *a casa i Frescobaldi* s'est développé moins fortement que le fr. *chez* et est aujourd'hui en voie de disparaître (v. Giorgio Pasquali, *Lingua nostra* 1, 9 et mes remarques *MLN* LV, 471), *casa* tendait au moyen âge à devenir l'équivalent de 'famille': plutôt 'la famille N' que 'la famille de N', la collectivité du *casato* ou *casamento* étant personnifiée dans la 'maison.' Le professeur Giandomenico Serra, qui se rallie (dans une carte du 1 janvier 1941) à la théorie que j'avais exposée l. c., me fournit un passage du "Regestum Lucense" no. 1188, anno 1160:

Hoc idem dicit quod faciebant omnes eius vicini, excepto *casatum Bonciattori et casatum Bornecti Cacacci qui non tribuunt* guadium; de aliis supradictis non audivit quod facerent et de casa Iohannichi Vernacci non audivit quod faciat supradicta obedientia. Bonellus iuratus dixit idem quod Manasse, excepto de *casamenta de Colle, qui sunt homines filiorum Truffe*, et de omnibus filiorum Ricci, qui non dant guadium. Gregorius iuratus dixit idem quod Manasse, excepto quod exceptavit *casamentum Bonciattori et Brunecti Cacacci, qui nichil faciunt nisi eorum bona voluntate*, et dicit quod alii omnes tribuunt pro bando unum denarium vel duo per *casamentum*.

Aujourd'hui la même construction *ad sensum* se développe à partir du sens 'maison commerciale'—là aussi un **casa Bianchi ha* (ou *hanno*) *telefonato* pourrait se développer.

La tournure *Chez Vandamme sont venus* n'a donc rien de particulièrement dunkerquois, mais s'insère dans une tradition généralement française,³ qui peut tirer son origine de coutumes

³ Pierrehumbert cite encore la tournure *Frédéri chez Jean* 'fils de, fille de'; *Pierre chez l'oncle* 'mon cousin P.'; *Daniel chez ma mère* 'un fils du premier mariage de ma marâtre'—eh bien, cet usage, qui subordonne p. ex. dans *Pierre chez l'oncle* le fils au père en l'attachant à sa 'maison' (au point de renoncer à exprimer le rapport de parenté personnelle du locuteur avec Pierre!), se trouve aussi ailleurs: Brunot, "La pensée et la langue," p. 43, cite l'onomastique populaire d'un village de l'Auxois autour de 1870, qui fit porter au grand père le nom *Pierre Pape* (d'après un sobriquet

locales ayant trait à la maison, que j'ignore, mais qui fait subsister, même dans notre civilisation si émietée et désaxée, un *quid* de l'ancienne conception de la maison où résidait le chef de famille, quelque chose comme un *pluralis majestatis* à la 3^e personne.⁴ Il est très bien possible que *Chez Vandamme* . . . soit interprété dans des milieux picards ou picardisants comme l'article du pluriel (et c'est ce sentiment qui doit avoir suggéré l'explication de M. Vaganay), mais ce serait alors une explication *locale* d'un fait de langue répandu sur une aire beaucoup plus étendue.

LEO SPITZER

A NOTE ON COLERIDGE'S "KUBLA KHAN"

Nearly all critics appear to believe Coleridge's statement in the preface to "Kubla Khan" that he wrote the poem during an opium dream. This acceptance of Coleridge's story is, however, strange, for the poem itself proves that it is inaccurate. In the preface, after declaring that, while asleep from the effects of an

Pape), à sa fille celui de Manette Pape, au petit-fils celui de "le moinet de chez le père Pape"—l'appartenance à la maison des Pape est bien soulignée. Cf. l'anc. ital *Marco Lombardo della casa Lombardo di Venezia* ou *Marco Dada* [= *Marco da cá* (= *casa*)] *Lombardo*, cité par E. Levi, *RFH* 1, 352, le vénitien *Madonna Lisetta dada* (= *de casa*) *Qurino* (Boccace, *Decam.* iv, 2), l'asturien *ca ti fulano* 'en casa (de) tio fulano' (García-Lomas). Enfin, une expression comme "Ce sont des gens qui ont été bien de chez eux" dans la bouche des Bretonnes de P. Loti (*Matelots*, p. 79, les italiques sont originales) se traduirait bel et bien en all. *von Haus aus reich* et l'idée de la 'maison,' 'famille,' y est encore latente.

'Il est entendu que *chez* retire d'une main ce qu'il donne de l'autre: la notion de *casa* y est présente, mais à l'état atténué: c'est plutôt le corps astral, l'atmosphère de la maison que celle-ci. Les traductions de *chez* par 'bei, zu,' 'with, to' etc. sont toutes fausses. Brunot, "Histoire de la langue française" III, 645 rapporte la résistance des grammairiens du XVII^e siècle à admettre *je m'en vais chez vous*, dit à quelqu'un qui est logé dans la même maison (Oudin), et *chez Plutarque* 'dans les oeuvres de P.' (Vaugelas). Je suppose qu'encore aujourd'hui *chez Plutarque* fait vaguement supposer un personnage entouré d'une ambiance à lui, alors que *dans Plutarque* n'évoque qu'un bouquin. Littre glose bien 'dans l'esprit de,' l'esprit étant l'essence aérienne de la maison. Cf. anglais *with Shakespeare* . . . en comparaison avec *in Sh. we find* . . .

anodyne, the author composed from two to three hundred lines of poetry, Coleridge continues:

On awaking he appeared to have a distinct recollection of the whole, and taking his pen, ink, and paper, instantly and eagerly wrote down the lines that are here preserved. At this moment he was unfortunately called out by a person on business from Porlock, and detained by him above an hour, and on his return to his room, found, to his no small surprise and mortification, that though he still retained some vague and dim recollection of the general purport of the vision, yet, with the exception of some eight or ten scattered lines and images, all the rest had passed away.

Coleridge says that he had written down "the lines that are here preserved" before the "person" interrupted him, but this cannot be literally true; for the last part of the poem, that beginning "A damsel with a dulcimer," is a comment on Coleridge's loss of the vision. He says that he *would* build the dome in air if he could, a statement which implies that he is unable to, that he has already forgotten his dream. Coleridge must then have been interrupted before he wrote these final lines. In other words, "Kubla Khan" is not really a fragment. It is a complete lyric made up of a fragment of a vision and a comment on the loss of the rest of that vision. And the comment is so enchantingly sung that few readers would trade it for more of the vision. Perhaps the visitor from Porlock deserves thanks for what he did.

In *The Road to Xanadu* Professor Lowes has made the usual assumption that these last eighteen lines are part of the dream. His discoveries of sources have, in fact, confirmed him in the error. Finding that the picture Coleridge has given of himself at the end of the poem is apparently influenced by a description of the followers of a Tartar Emperor in *Purchas his Pilgrimes* and by a description of an Abyssinian King in James Bruce's *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile*,¹ Lowes fails to see that it is, nevertheless, a picture of Coleridge. He speaks, in fact, of the "Tartar youth with flashing eyes" and argues that the "vivid incoherence" of his introduction into the poem should banish doubt that the lines were dreamed by Coleridge.² Lowes does say at one point³ that it is just possible that Coleridge was interrupted before he finished the poem, but he assumes that even

¹ *The Road to Xanadu*, pp. 362, 378-9.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 409, 363.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 409.

if this is so the closing lines of the poem represent memories of the dream and that the figure with flashing eyes and floating hair is a remnant of the vision.⁴

It is certain, however, that the flashing eyes and floating hair belong to Coleridge. Coleridge is saying that if he could describe Kubla's dome,⁵ listeners would be in awe of him. They would shrink from him when they saw his (Coleridge's own) flashing eyes and floating hair, signs that he had eaten of divine food, i. e., that he was feeling a divine inspiration.

Lowes might have been less certain that the passage from Bruce cited above was the source for the flashing eyes and floating hair if he had realized that Coleridge was describing himself. Of course it is not impossible that Coleridge remembered the words of Bruce ("[the king's] long hair floating around his face, wrapt up in his mantle so that nothing but his eyes could be seen") when he drew this picture of himself, but a more important influence was probably what he had seen in the mirror.⁶ Nearly every contemporary who describes Coleridge declares that his eyes were bright and animated, particularly when he was talking. Dorothy Wordsworth was greatly impressed by this fact when she first met him. She says in her letter to Mary Hutchinson of June, 1797: "His eye . . . speaks every emotion of his animated mind; it has more of the

⁴ As proof that he considered this part of the dream, we have Lowes' statement (p. 363) that "nobody in his waking senses could have fabricated those amazing [last] eighteen lines." Elsewhere (p. 104) he says that in "Kubla Khan" "we see the unconscious playing *its* game alone." Practically all other critics have also treated the whole poem as a dream. Among those who have been most specific in their statements to this effect are H. D. Traill in *Coleridge*, pp. 56-57; Robert Graves in *The Meaning of Dreams* (London, 1924), pp. 146-159; M. H. Abrams in *The Milk of Paradise* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 46-47; and Lawrence Hanson in *The Life of S. T. Coleridge, The Early Years* (London, 1938), p. 260. Hanson calls "Kubla Khan" "the supreme example in English literature of the workings of the creative subconscious, unhelped—or unhindered—by conscious composition."

⁵ Coleridge does not explain why the recall of a song sung by a damsel in another vision would enable him to bring back the vision of the pleasure dome. Apparently he feels that both visions are locked in the same part of his brain.

⁶ Clement Carlyon in *Early Years and Late Reflections* (London, 1836), I, 29, reports that Coleridge was wont to look at himself whenever there was a mirror in the room.

'poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling' than I ever witnessed."⁷ Then, too, Coleridge's hair was many times described as being long and disordered. Willham Jerdan even declares that it floated in the air on one occasion when Coleridge was excited.⁸ Most striking are the frequent descriptions of the animation of Coleridge's face when he was talking or reading his poetry,⁹ and the evidence that he was himself conscious of (and conceited about) his fine appearance on such occasions.¹⁰ Such testimony leaves little doubt that at the end of "Kubla Khan" Coleridge has pictured himself, not a creature from his dream.¹¹

⁷ Hazlitt in "My First Acquaintance with Poets" (*Complete Works*, ed P P Howe [London, 1930-34], xvii, 109) and Harriet Martineau in her *Autobiography* (Boston, 1877), i, 299, make similar statements.

⁸ *Autobiography* (London, 1853), iv, 233. Dorothy Wordsworth (*loc. cit.*) calls Coleridge's hair "longish" and "loose-growing," and Hazlitt (*loc. cit.*) says that it "fell in smooth masses over his forehead."

⁹ Charles Cowden Clarke in *Recollections of Writers* (London, 1878), p. 64, gives the following description of Coleridge as he appeared in the midst of an outburst of praise for Beethoven: "His elevated tone as he rolled forth his gorgeous sentences, his lofty look, his sustained flow of language, his sublime utterance, gave the effect of some magnificent organ peal to our entranced ears." See also Lamb's description of Coleridge in a letter to Wordsworth dated April 26, 1818, and Washington Allston's comment on Coleridge's appearance when the "divine afflatus" possessed him (*Life and Letters of Washington Allston* [New York, 1892], p. 104).

¹⁰ Clement Carlyon (*op. cit.*, i, 29-30) says that Coleridge boasted about how his negligence in dress was lost sight of the moment he began to talk, and Thomas Frognall Dibdin declares in *Reminiscences of a Literary Life* (London, 1836), i, 255, that Coleridge's face revealed "the secret conviction that his auditors seemed to be entranced with his powers of discourse."

¹¹ Lowes' discovery of a Tartar youth in "Kubla Khan" is influenced by his postulated source from Purchas (*Road to Xanadu*, pp. 362-363). Purchas tells how a Tartar emperor introduced his followers to a cleverly contrived paradise filled with damsels and provided with milk, honey, and clear water. Thereafter these warriors, hoping to die and enter that paradise forever, were fearless in battle. Lowes' assumption is that the one with flashing eyes and floating hair in "Kubla Khan" is such a warrior and that he is therefore to be feared. But Coleridge in fact represents the flashing eyes and floating hair as inspiring holy dread—that is, awe rather than terror. And since this is so, may the milk and honey not have come from the Promised Land of the Old Testament, which is many times (*Exodus*, 3, 8; *Lev.*, 20, 24; *Josh.* 5, 6; etc.) described as flowing with milk and honey? According to the *NED*, *honey dew* and *honey* are often synonymous.

Even though the sense of the poem did not prove that the last lines of "Kubla Khan" were written after the visitor had returned to Porlock, the student of Coleridge might very well have been able to guess that such was the case. For there is a difference between what one imagines when under the influence of opium and what one imagines when not under that influence. This has been made clear by De Quincey, who describes the effect of opium on his imagination in part as follows:

I seemed every night to descend—not metaphorically, but literally to descend—into chasms and sunless abysses, depths below depths, from which it seemed hopeless that I could ever reascend. . . .

The sense of space, and in the end the sense of time, were both powerfully affected. Buildings, landscapes, &c., were exhibited in proportions so vast as the bodily eye is not fitted to receive. Space swelled and was amplified to an extent of unutterable and self-repeating infinity. This, however, did not disturb me so much as the vast expansion of time. Sometimes I seemed to have lived for seventy or a hundred years in one night; nay, sometimes had feelings representative of a duration far beyond the limits of any human experience.¹²

Now in the first part of "Kubla Khan" there are several indications of these effects. It is true that Coleridge does not reveal them in so extraordinary a manner as De Quincey, but it is to be remembered that Coleridge was as yet a neophyte in his use of the drug. Certainly Coleridge's "deep romantic chasm," his caverns, and his sunless sea are like De Quincey's "chasms and sunless abysses." Moreover, in the first part of "Kubla Khan" there are indications that Coleridge was experiencing the widening of the limits of space and time described by De Quincey. The caverns are "measureless to man,"¹³ the forests are "ancient as the hills," and Kubla hears a message from the remote past,—“ancestral voices prophesying war.”¹⁴ In the last eighteen lines of the

¹² *Collected Writings*, ed. David Masson, III, 435. As M. H. Abrams states (*op. cit.*, p. 65, n.), confirmation of these symptoms occurs in almost every article that has been written on the subject of opium.

¹³ It must be admitted that one finite phrase, "twice five miles of fertile ground," sounds unlike a part of an opium dream.

¹⁴ There is another indication that the first part of the poem was written when Coleridge was affected by opium. In a letter which he wrote to his brother George in 1798, Coleridge said: "Laudanum gave me repose, not sleep; but you, I believe, know how divine that repose is, what a spot of enchantment, a green spot of fountain and flowers and trees in the very

poem, on the other hand, the images are clearly outlined and finite. The damsel with the dulcimer and Coleridge himself are described with poetic imagination, but they have none of the vagueness and grandeur of the phantoms of an opium dream. This change in atmosphere is striking.

Lines 31-36 of "Kubla Khan," those beginning with "The shadow of the dome of pleasure," lie between the two parts discussed above. These lines may, of course, represent the "eight or ten scattered lines or images" that remained of the dreamed poem after the person from Porlock had departed. If so, the composition of the poem is to be described as follows: Lines 1-30 are what Coleridge had written down when he was interrupted; lines 31-36 represent his effort to continue the vision; and lines 37-54 are his comment on his loss of the vision.

N. B. ALLEN

The University of Delaware

JOHN MIRK ON BONFIRES, ELEPHANTS AND DRAGONS

In his homily for the feast of St. John the Baptist John Mirk describes the manner of celebrating the vigil, a description of obvious value to the historian of folk-custom and yet, apparently, little noted.¹ The account runs:

But 3et, yn þe worschip of Saynt Ion, men waken at evyn and maken þre maner of fyrys: on ys clen bonys and no wod, and ys callyd a bonnefyre; anoþer ys of clene wod and no bonys, and ys callyd a wakefyre, for men syttyth and wakyth by hit; þe thryd ys made of bonys and of wode, and ys callyd Saynt Ionys fyre.²

heart of waste sands" (*Letters of S. T. Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge [New York, 1895], I, 240). The letter, whether written before or after "Kubla Khan," indicates that the luxuriant beauty of a garden was to Coleridge a symbol for the repose found in opium.

¹ Sir James G. Frazer, for example, in *Balder the Beautiful* (London, 1913) discusses the St. John fires in Europe with copious reference to our sources of information. It is significant that he makes no mention of Mirk's testimony. See *Balder the Beautiful*, pp. 160-219.

² Festial (ed. T. Erbe), London, 1905 (E. E. T. S., E. S. xcvi), pp. 182-3.

I have been unable to determine whether Mirk is merely repeating some literary tradition or whether he is describing an actually observed British custom. In either event I have been unable to find source, analogue, or parallel account. The well-known and traditional mediaeval description of the St. John celebration is that represented by the account in John Beleth's *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. It is worth printing again to facilitate comparison with Mirk's description:

Solent porro hoc tempore ex veteri consuetudine mortuorum animalium ossa comburi, quod hujusmodi habet originem. Sunt enim animalia, quae dracones appellamus . . . Haec, inquam, animalia in aere volant, in aquis natant, in terra ambulant. Sed quando in aere ad libidinem concitantur (quod fere fit), saepe ipsum sperma vel in puteos, vel in aquas fluviales ejiciunt ex quo lethalis sequitur annus. Adversus haec ergo hujusmodi inventum est remedium, ut videlicet rogos ex ossibus construeretur, et ita fumus hujusmodi animalia fugaret. Et quia istud maxime hoc tempore fiebat, idem etiam modo ab omnibus observatur. Est et alia causa quamobrem ossa animalia comburantur, quod ossa sancti Joannis in civitate Sebastae ab ethnicis combusta fuere. Consuetum item est hac vigilia ardentes deferri faculas, quod Joannes fuerit ardens lucerna, et qui vias Domini praeeparavit. Sed quod etiam rota vertatur hinc esse putant, quia in eum circulum tunc, sol descenderit ultra quem progredi nequit, a quo cogitur paulatim descendere, quemadmodum vulgi rumor de B. Joanne Christo adveniente ad summum pervenit, cum Christus putabatur, posteaque descendit ac fuit diminutus, ut vel ipse de se testis est.³

It will be immediately observed that there is nothing in the *Festial* about the ceremony of the lighted torches or the rolling wheel. But, on the other hand, nothing in Beleth's account corresponds to Mirk's mention of the three different kinds of fire.

It is worth noting that Mirk was familiar with the account in the *Rationale*:

The fyrst fyre was made of bonyes, as Ion Bellet sayth, for yn þat contray ys gret hete þe whech hete encawsut dragons þat þay gedryn ynfere, and fleyn yn þe ayre, and fallyn downe ynto watyrs þe frope of hur kynde, and soo venemyth þe watyrs, þat moch pepyll takyn her deth þerby and oþer mony gret sekene.⁴

So much is clearly taken from the passage in Beleth that we have

³ Migne, *P. L.*, cccii, cols. 141-2. Cf. J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Berlin, 1875-8, I, 516; J. M. Kemble, *The Saws in England*, London, 1876, I, 361-2; Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, 161.

⁴ *Festial*, p. 183.

already quoted. But whereas Beleth is content to explain that a fire made of bones was especially popular as a remedy against the pestilential dragon in the time of St. John and that the people annually light similar fires to commemorate the historical fact, Mirk interweaves into his explanation of the custom the old story of Alexander's stratagem against elephants:

Then wer þer mony gret clerkys, and haddyn red of kyng Aliþandyr how when he schulde haue a batayle wyth þe kyng of Inde, and þe kyng broght wyth hym mony olyfaundys beryng castellys of tre on hor backys, as þe kynde of hom ys, and knyghtys armyd yn þe castels, arayde al for þe warre. Then knew Alyþaundyr þe kynde of þe olyfaundys, þat þay dredyn nothyng so moch as rorryng of swyne. Wherfor he let gedyr alle þe swyne þat myght be getyn, and made hom to dryue hom also nygh þe olyfaundys, as þai myghtyn wele here hor roryng. And þen he let make a pig forto crye, and þen anon all infere made soch a rorryng, þat all þe olyfaundys floen, and castyn downe hor castels, and sloyn þe knyghtys þat werne yn ham; and soo Alesaundyr had þe victori.⁵

Immediately after this diverting interlude Mirk concludes with what seems to be singular abruptness:

Thes wyse clerkys kneuyn wele þat dragons hatyth nothyng so meche as brent bonys. Wherfor þay tacht þe pepyll forto gedyr al þe bonys þat þay myght fynde, and sett hom on fyre; and soo wyth þe stench of hom þay dryven away the dragon, and soo werne holpyn of hor deses.⁶

But what has all this to do with the story of the elephants? Is Mirk merely implying that the same wise clerks who knew the natural history of the elephant were also up on their dragon lore? Clarity is conspicuously absent from the explanation given by Mirk, but an examination of Bestiary beliefs reveals that there is good reason for connecting the stories of the elephant and of the dragon.

One of the details of the Greek *Physiologus* involves the hostility existing between the dragon and the elephant.⁷ Perhaps the fullest account of their combats and of the reasons for the animosity is found in Pliny's *Natural History*.⁸ And in the later Latin Bestiaries we are informed of an interesting consequence of the "perpetua discordia" between the two creatures: whenever a fire

⁵ *Festial*, p. 183.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Physiologus* (ed. F. Sbordone), Milan, 1936, p. 131.

⁸ *viii*, 11-12.

is made of the elephant's hair and bones, "no evil thing will come, nor dragon."⁹

Mirk's mention of the elephant, therefore, is not introduced altogether haphazardly. The rout of the dragons was originally accomplished not merely by a fire made of bones, but, more specifically, made of elephant bones. It is too bad that Mirk has left out the necessary connecting links in his explanation—if, indeed, the fault is Mirk's and not some scribe's.

The general impression of disorder in the passage is confirmed by the intrusion of the story of Alexander. If it is proper to speak of elephants in explaining the bonfires, the animal's aversion to the roaring of swine is surely not the appropriate detail. A glance at the Bestiaries may again prove useful in alleviating bewilderment if not in justifying the inclusion of the story. The Westminster Bestiary ends its chapter on the elephant with these two statements: "Alexander frightened these beasts away from his camp by the grunting of swine. The dragon drinks the blood of the elephant for the purpose of cooling his burning intestines."¹⁰ There is no real connection between the two statements, but they are in juxtaposition and thus may well have influenced Mirk's erudite but unhappily muddled discussion of the origin of the St. John bonfires. For the second of the two statements, involving the hostility of the elephant and dragon, was very much to his purpose.

GROVER CRONIN, JR.

Fordham University

NICHOLAS BRETON'S *THE HATE OF TREASON*

Throughout his long though not always distinguished career as a writer, Nicholas Breton peppered his works with expressions of loyalty and devotion to the ruling monarch and the English Government. These probably unsolicited attentions do not seem to have brought him any recognition; though his *The Hate of Treason* and *A Murmur* present the Government point of view, and the latter (dedicated to the Lords of the Privy Council) may well have been officially inspired. The discovery of the Gunpowder

⁹ MS. Harleian 3244, quoted by G. C. Druce, "The Elephant in Medieval Legend and Art," *Archaeological Journal*, 2nd Series, xxvi (1919), 6. Cf. Cahier and Martin, *Mélanges d'Archéologie*, Paris, 1851-6, iv, 157-8.

¹⁰ MS. 22, Westminster Chapter Library, quoted by Druce, *ibid.*, p. 8.

Plot aroused all Breton's loyalty and indignation;¹ which he expressed at length in *The Hate of Treason with a Touch of the late Treason*. There is an undated copy of this poem, headed with the caption of the printed version, *An Invective against Treason*, in MS. Royal 17 C XXXIV² in the British Museum; and a printed version dated 1616, without the printer's name.³ It is reasonable to suppose that it was written shortly after the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605. Both versions are dedicated to the Duke of Lineux (i. e. Lennox, the king's favourite); if this dedication had been written after 6th October 1613, Breton, as was his custom, would have given his patron the full titles of Baron Settrington and Earl of Richmond. *The Hate of Treason*, then, was written between November 1605 and October 1613: and the only surviving edition of 1616 was not the first. The dedications in the manuscript and in this edition are a little different:

. . . with these few Inuectiue lines, against the vile name of Treason and Traitors: wherein, naminge no person offendinge, and, wishing there had neuer been suche offence, leauinge the Tract to the perusinge of yo^r discrete patience, with my better seruice to yo^r Gracious Emplotment, I humbly reste:

Yo^r Graces diuoted to be Comaunded
Nich: Breton.⁴

. . . these fewe invective lines against the most hatefull, and horrible nature of Treason, and Traitors: I name no person offendant, and wish there were no such offence But hoping that God will weede out the wicked, and blesse his Maiesty with a world of loving Subjects & encrease his love with many such good friends as your selfe, in prayer for his Maiesties, and your long life, with health, and all hearts happinesse, I humbly rest

Your Graces in all humble service,
N. B.⁵

¹ An interesting link between Breton and the actors in the Gunpowder drama is the dedication of *Wonders Worth The Hearing*, signed 22 of December, 1602, "To my truest and kinde louing friend, Ma Iohn Cradocke Cutler, at his house without Temple Doore." On 6th November 1605, John Cradocke declared that he engraved sword hilts with the Passion of Christ, for Rakewood, Chris. Wright, and another. Catesby and Tyrwhit were often with him. (*Calendar of State Papers James I—Domestic Series*, xvi.)

² Reprinted by Grosart in *The Works in Verse and Prose of Nicholas Breton*.

³ Grosart was not able to see the unique copy, which is now in the H. E. Huntington Library.

⁴ MS. Royal 17 C xxxiv.

⁵ *The Hate of Treason* (1616)—Huntington Library.

The signature "Nich: Breton" at the end of the manuscript dedication establishes his authorship.⁶ There is an address in the printed version, not found in the manuscript, "To all that love God, and the King":

Nobles, and Gentlemen, and all other his Maiesties loving subiects, of what condition soever, let me laie before your eies a few invective lines, against the horrible nature of Treason, and especially against so gracious a King, Queene, and Prince, so honourable a Counsaile, and so blessed a State The consideration whereof, may make the hearts of all true Christians to tremble, to thinke that the Divell had so great a power in the world, as to sow so much wickednesse in the hearts of vnhappie men But God, that euer is, and will be gracious vnto his, hath revealed their villanie, and so preserved his people, as in the preservation of our King and Countrey, from the Divell and all his devices, hath given iust cause, day and night to give glorie to his holie Maiestie, to whose Almighty tuition and mercifull goodnesse I leave thee. From my lodging in London

Your friend as I find cause.

There are the same number of verses in the manuscript as in the printed book; but the sequence is different: and in place of this verse in the manuscript

But this good God that gave vs our good King:
and made the sorrowes of our harts to cease,
reveales all tractes, y^t doe of Treason spring;
blesseth our Land, preserves itt in his peace,
and doth our sowles, from sinnefull feares release:
how can his name, nough be prays'd of vs?
that shews his care, his love, and mercy thus;

the printed book has an extra verse on the sin of pride:

⁶ Breton's authorship is confirmed by this parallel with his *Pasquils Mad-Cap*:

Yet let him tinck vpon the golden pan,
His word may pass yet for an honest man.

Pasquils Mad-Cap.

While graceless thoughts, in all vngodlines,
doe only tincke, vpon ye goulden panne.

The Hate of Treason.

Also, as Grosart noticed, three stanzas from *The Soules immortall crowne*, dedicated by Breton to James I in 1605, are worked into *The Hate of Treason* without much change beyond the addition of an extra line to each verse necessitated by the use of rhyme royal in *The Hate of Treason*. Treason being an evil fruit of pride, verses 1-3 of *The sixth daies worke—Humilitie* (*The Soules immortall crowne*) are introduced appropriately into *The Hate of Treason*.

Let pride be hatefull vnto every state,
 It is a vice with vertue not allowed;
 And such a vice as vertue hath in hate;
 For vertue never makes the spirit prowde,
 But hath her love to the simple avowde.
 And in aduancement of Nobilitie,
 Gives greatest grace to Truths humilitie.

Towards the end of the poem there are two alternative couplets:

Oh hellish Pride, the Essence of all Euill; and only liue, to leade Man to the Devill.	MS.
Of hellish pride, the onely Traytor Thiefe, That is the ground of all eternall grieffe.	Book.

The Hate of Treason is described as imperfect in the *Short-Title Catalogue*: this is because two verses on sig. C3^r and C3^v have been partially obliterated.

JEAN ROBERTSON

University of Liverpool

THE ASCRIPTION OF SPEECHES IN THE REVENGER'S TRAGEDY

Every editor of Tourneur's *Revenger's Tragedy* has noted the careless printing of the Quarto of 1607, which is the basis of all existing texts. The punctuation is unusually erratic, letters are frequently transposed, and in some cases the ascription of speeches is obviously incorrect. In a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* (March 13, 1937) Major C. S. Napier calls attention to the most puzzling section of the text, the speeches in the last scene of Ambitioso and Supervacuo, Spurio, the bastard, and the "fourth man." They enter to find Lussurioso, the new duke, murdered, and, after an exchange of exclamations, speak as follows:

Amb. Here's a labour sav'd,
 I thought to have sped him, Sbloud how came this.
Spur. Then I proclaime my selfe, now I am Duke.
Amb. Thou Duke, brother thou liest.
Spur. Slave so dost thou?
 4. Base villayne hast thou slaine my Lord and Master.¹

¹ Quarto, 18v.

It is obvious from the ensuing action that the two brothers and the bastard have been killed here; and modern editors have added the stage directions "Kills Ambitioso" after Spurio's last speech, and "Stabs Spurio" after the speech of the "fourth man." As Major Napier points out, the text, even with these added directions, cannot be right; the bastard would not be the first in line to become duke, and Supervacuo is not disposed of. "But," Major Napier writes,

if it be Supervacuo who proclaims himself duke, all is well. and we may add the stage directions to Ambitioso's last words " [*Kills Supervacuo* " That Supervacuo should proclaim himself duke before his elder brother is not altogether surprising in view of his initiative at the opening of Act III, Scene 1, and at the close of Act v, Scene 2 [*sic*, but undoubtedly Scene 1 is meant]. but the truth seems to be that by Act v Tourneur had forgotten which was which.

The confusion of the abbreviations for Spurio and Supervacuo is obviously probable and actually occurs earlier in the play,² but the confusion of Supervacuo with Ambitioso is still troublesome and can only be cleared up in conjunction with another scene in which they appear to be confused. Even if Major Napier is right in saying that Tourneur by Act v "had forgotten which was which," scenes i and iii of Act v (modern scene-division) are not consistent. Whichever brother says in v, i, "this hand shall dispossesse him [the duke]"³ should say in v, iii, "Here's a labour sav'd, I thought to have sped him."⁴ In the Quarto the first speech is given to Supervacuo, the second to Ambitioso. This difficulty remains, then, after the confusion of Spurio with Supervacuo is removed; and a more thorough correction is necessary to make the allotment of the lines logical.

Surely Professor Allardyce Nicoll is right in exchanging the speeches of Ambitioso and Supervacuo at the close of v, i.⁵ The reading of the Quarto is manifestly inaccurate as it gives one speech to "And." (interpreted by several editors as Antonio, though he is not on the stage here). And again logic is against the Quarto reading, for it is clearly established in III, i and vi⁶ that Ambitioso

² III, vi, modern scene-division; Quarto F^{4r}.

³ *Ibid.*, I^{2r}.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I^{3v}.

⁵ *The Revenger's Tragedy*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (London, 1929), p. 149, lines 190 ff. Cf. Quarto, I^{2r} and v.

⁶ *Ibid.*, D^{4v}, and F^{4r}.

is the elder brother and that Supervacuo intends to kill him when the old Duke and Lussurioso are out of the way. Hence, in v, i, Ambitioso should be the one to say:

it [the moon] shall out-live the new Duke by much, this hand shall dispossesse him, then we're mighty.⁷

to which Supervacuo would reply:

Ist so, 'ts very good,
And do you thinke to be Duke then, kinde brother:
He see faire play, drop one, and there lies tother.⁸

Professor Nicoll does not suggest any emendation in v, iii, though he notes the confusion here.⁹ It is quite proper (once the changes in V, i have been made) that Ambitioso, who threatened to kill the Duke, should now say:

Here's a labour sav'd,
I thought to have sped him, Sbloud how came this.

But he should have also the following line:

Then I proclaime my selfe, now I am Duke.

The next line should be Supervacuo's:

Thou Duke,! brother thou liest.

If a stage direction is to be inserted after this line it will be "Kills Ambitioso." Spurio then says, "Slave so dost thou?" and kills Supervacuo; the "fourth man" kills Spurio, and the three rivals are accounted for. The latter part of the play is thus made consistent with the earlier part and consistent with itself.

EUGENE M. WAITH

Yale University

GOLDSMITH AND THE PICKLE-SHOP

When Goldsmith, in an argument with Johnson recorded by Boswell, insisted that luxury was degenerating the English people, Johnson challenged him to choose from all the shops between Charing-Cross and White-Chapel, excepting the gin-shops, one in which there was anything "that can do any human being any harm." He accepted the challenge and selected a pickle-shop.¹ Since it would

⁷ Quarto, I^{2r}.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I^{2r}.

⁹ Nicoll, p. 319.

¹ Boswell's *Life*, ed. G. B. Hill, II, 217-19.

appear that if Goldsmith could condemn the lowly pickle he would also condemn every item of modern luxury, this argument has been used to show his inconsistency, for did he not describe "The Benefits of Luxury in Making a People Wise and Happy" in Letter xi of *The Citizen of the World*?²

But the pickle, as an appetizer, was used to stimulate "artificial" (as opposed to "natural") appetite by those who had lost their natural appetite through surfeiting.³ In choosing the pickle-shop as an example of harmful luxury, Goldsmith, who derided the "epicure" and believed that Parliament should enforce the "Divine precept" of weekly fasting,⁴ was thus really attacking gluttony, as did many moralists and physicians of his age in a tradition stemming from the ancients.⁵ Addison, for example, saw "innumerable distempers" resulting from modern eating habits; in particular he denounced "any artificial provocative to relieve satiety, and create a false appetite."⁶ Likewise, Dr. Francis de Valangin argued that the English have so many infirmities because they "study how to tickle their Palates with Variety, Profusion, and pungent Sauces."⁷ At such protests, of course, Johnson merely laughed: he preferred to "feed with the rich."⁸

Goldsmith's argument here should not, then, be construed as an attack upon all luxury or as a contradiction of the opinion expressed in Letter xi of *The Citizen* that the innocent indulgence of human desires for pleasure is socially beneficial.

HOWARD J. BELL, JR.

Bradley Polytechnic Institute

² Footnote to Letter xi in *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. P. Cunningham (London, 1854), II, 116, and ed. J. W. M. Gibbs (London, 1885-6), III, 43; C. B. Tinker, *Nature's Simple Plan* (Princeton, 1922), p. 4.

³ See A. F. M. Willich, M. D., *Lectures on Diet and Regimen* (London, 1799, 2nd ed.), p. 297; also Goldsmith, *Works* (ed. Gibbs), I, 292 ("even pickles cannot procure them an appetite").

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 56 (*Citizen*, Letter xv); and *An History of the Earth and Animated Nature* (London, 1774), IV, 186; V, 174, 206, 350; VI, 398-9; and II, 130.

⁵ For instance, Plutarch, in advising against gluttony, compared appetizers to aphrodisiacs (*Moralia*, 126 B).

⁶ *The Spectator*, 195.

⁷ *A Treatise on Diet, or the Management of Human Life* (London, 1768), pp. 11-12.

⁸ Boswell's *Life*, III, 56, 282-3; V, 357-8; and II, 79.

"THE WOLF'S LONG HOWL"

Cyrus Redding, Thomas Campbell's sub-editor on the *New Monthly Magazine* and his biographer, pointed out that the wolf in Campbell's formerly oft-quoted line, "The wolf's long howl from Oonalaska's shore," which occurs in the *Pleasures of Hope* (I, 66), published in 1799, is heard again in *Theodric* (1824): "The wolf's long howl is dismal discord join'd" (l. 471).¹ Actually, this later verse was borrowed intact from *The Sentimental Sailor; or St. Preux to Eloisa*, "by a young gentleman of Edinburgh," published in that city by Kincaid and Creech, 1772. It therefore appears that the line in *The Sentimental Sailor* likewise suggested the verse in the *Pleasures of Hope*. It is curious that in the earlier poem, Campbell borrowed but half the line whereas in that published twenty-five years later he incorporated it bodily. Whether he took it from the poem itself or from the review in the *Scots Magazine* (xxxv, May, 182), where it is reprinted, would be hard to say.

CHARLES DUFFY

Cornell University

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1939 AND 1940¹

Since my survey of two years ago a number of important works in the linguistic field have come out. First place, for American linguists at least, must be given to the *Atlas* of Professor Hans Kurath and his associates, the first volume of which is now to be had (together with a *Handbook*), though at a price prohibitive to most.² The volume is made up of 242 maps, out of a total of 733; the others are to come out in vols. II and III. The *Handbook* is a separate work; it not only gives us a guide in using the maps, but also provides a history of the undertaking, a sketch of the

¹ *Reminiscences of Thomas Campbell*, London, 1860, I, 282.

² Except for the first four items, this survey is limited to books sent to MLN. for review.

³ *Linguistic Atlas of New England*, Vol. I (in two parts), Brown University, 1939, \$60; *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England*, pp. xiv + 240 + 2 plates, \$4.

historical and cultural background, and a critical account of the methods followed by the *Atlas* staff. The careful evaluation of the technic of the various individual field-workers is especially worthy of note. A proper estimate of this impressive publication will not be possible until the whole is available. While awaiting maps 243-733, however, we may pay tribute to the competence of the work done so far, and in particular to the initiative and perseverance of its director.

For some time now the publication of the *Dictionary of American English* has been under way. Vol. I was completed in 1938, vol. II in 1940.³ Its companion work, the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, likewise prepared under the editorship of Sir William Craigie, is making slower headway in print. Publication of the first volume, begun in 1931, was not completed until 1937, and so far only two parts of the second volume have appeared.⁴ The great Danish dictionary, however, has gone forward at its usual pace of a volume a year.⁵ It is to be hoped that the course of events in Europe will not stop this stately progress.

The volumes of the English Place-Name Society also come out at regular yearly intervals. The two now before us⁶ maintain the high standards set in earlier volumes. Certain details may be commented upon. I see nothing strange (vol. XVI, p. xxxvi) in the form *Patryxtavy*. The name of the OE runic letter is *wynn*, not *wen* (pp. 4, 284). What is partial (p. 26) about the gallicism of *Haute*? The name *Ingen* (p. 28) may be short for *Ingenþeow* (see *Widsith* 116). Under *Brockhurst* (p. 38) a cross-reference to *Burcombe Ivers* (p. 213) would be useful. Why should *Hassukes* (p. 38) be called pseudo-genitival? The earliest occurrence of the spelling *Shorncote* (p. 47) ought to be given, if only for the sake of those interested in the history of *ar* / *or* alternation. In the same way one would like to know when the initial *w* of *Underditch* (p. 371) was lost. *Flands* (p. 50) is derivable from OE **fulung*

³ Corn Pit to Honk, pp. 629-1268; Univ. of Chicago Press.

⁴ The second of these parts, Dignosce-Dull, pp. 121-240 of the volume (Univ. of Chicago Press), comes within the period of this survey.

⁵ *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, XVIII (1939), pp. 748 and XIX (1940), pp. 725; Copenhagen, Gyldendalske Boghandel.

⁶ XVI (1939), *The Place-Names of Wiltshire*, pp. xlii + 547, \$6.50; XVII (1940), *The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire*, pp. xlii + 348, \$5.90; both by J. E. B. Gover, Allen Mawer and F. M. Stenton; Cambridge, at the University Press (New York: Macmillan).

'mry, muddy place'; for the want of umlaut, see *MLN.*, LIV 527 and note forms like the *Wulfingum* of *Widsith* 29; for the modern *i* see p. xx. The term pre-English (pp. 60, 332) is an unfortunate device for not saying Celtic; if the latter term must be avoided, why not say non-English? The first element of *Sundeyes* (p. 66) may be identical with *Sound* (p. 301); certainly the 14th century *o*-spelling does not justify connexion with OE *sand*, as *o* is commonly written for *u* before *n*. The phonology of *Nettleton* (pp. 80 f.) requires derivation of the first element from a weak **Nepla* > **Netla* (cf. **boþl* > *botl* 'dwelling') rather than from a strong **Neðel*, which is incompatible with the *t* found in all the forms, and might be expected to give a genitival *s* nowhere recorded. The OG cognate *Nandilo* is weak, not strong. On the other hand, the first element of *Wadswick* (p. 85) is best derived from **Wæd*, the strong form of *Wada*; the diminutive **Wæddi* which Ekwall suggests seems less likely, since no *-en(e)s-* forms occur. *Hazeland* from earlier *Haselholt* (p. 88) got its *n* by dissimilation; the resultant **Haselont* then became *Hazeland* by assimilation to the familiar *land*. The first element of *Thingley* (p. 97) may be from OE *geþinge*. The value [dz] for the initial letter of *Gifford* (p. 119) should have been given on p. xxi, where this sound-change is exemplified only in final position, and is mentioned only incidentally. *Raesters* (p. 151) is best explained as an example of metathesis: *rst* > *str*. The 1576 forms *Radenhurst* and *Radnester* show that the final *s* of the modern form is not original. The same metathesis of *st* and *r* appears in *Chilvester* (p. 257). The sound-change [tʃ > ʃ], as in *Conrish* (p. 179) and *Wishford* (p. 230), is not listed on p. xxi. The forms *ceolc* (p. 204) and *sceocera* (p. 292) show the primitive *eo* from which classical OE *ea* came. For *Saxon* (p. 213) read OE. The postulated proper name *Bryda* (p. 213) is derivable from a base *brygd* 'shifty.' If the first element of *Yatesbury* (p. 264) is the proper name *Geat*, the forms without genitival *s* are to be derived from the weak *Geata*; cf. ON *Gauti*. In spite of the authors (p. 300), the name-form *Evenes-* is explicable as a case of dittography (from earlier *euenes* for *eues*). The sound [ø] was general, not merely dialectal (p. 314), in ME, though it lost its rounding much earlier in some dialects than in others. For *Anglo-Saxon* (p. 333) read OE. The sound-change [ʃt > xt] is exemplified in *Aughton* (p. 344), as also in *Wroughton* (p. 278); it ought to be included among the sound-shifts listed

on p. xxi. The invariable *t* of *Martinseil* (p. 351) requires derivation from some such name as *Mæpla*; this name in turn may be hypocoristic for *Mæpelhelm*, but of this we have no evidence. The short *o* of *Stonage* (p. 360) is not explicable in terms of a consonant group *nh*. I have noted misprints on pp. xv (note 1), 353 and 376.

Leland's spelling *Snotinghamshire* (vol. xvii, p. 175) is much later than any spelling with initial *s* recorded on p. 1, though Leland may be looked upon as too late to be reckoned with. It is hardly right to say, "we must take the forms *medene*, *medine* as due to early change of *m* to *n* under the influence of preceding *d*" (p. 6); the change may have been due to dissimilation. The names *Whipling* (p. 9) and *Smite* seem equally appropriate (or inappropriate) for the river. Possibly the current was swifter in early times. The name-form *Saundby* (p. 38) is additional evidence that the ME diphthong *au* developed before nasals in Gmc. words; see my study in *MP.*, xx 189 ff. Since *hræmn* and *hræm* are well known OE variants of *hræfn* 'raven,' the corresponding forms of *Rampton* (p. 58) can hardly be stigmatized as irregular: in *Ramingtona* we get a svarabhakti vowel between *m* and *n*, and the same form, with loss of *n* before *t*, appears in the *Rametone* of DB. The series of forms seems to me consistent enough. The comments under *Stokeham* (pp. 60 f.) seem curiously confused. The variants of *Ranby* (p. 66) with genitival *s* make derivation from ON *Hrani* dubious. The discussion of the "sound development" of *Conjure Alders* (p. 70) is so unsatisfactory that it would have been better to leave the matter without discussion. For the spelling *Manneton* (p. 107), see *MP.*, xx, 189 ff. The form *Calkcliff* (p. 129) need not be analysed as the spelling would indicate; the *-k* of *Calk* is derivable from the initial sound of the second element. For *philological* (p. 131) read *linguistic*. *Harlow* (p. 134) is best analysed as whore-hill. In *Algarthorpe* (p. 138) the vocalism does not support the derivation given; the *ger* spelling would indicate East rather than West Scand origin. Under *Toton* (p. 152) the DB forms point to a man named *þólfr* and familiarly called *Tófi*. The alternative forms *Snointon* and *Sneinton* (p. 174) seem to reflect variants of the name with and without umlaut; the suffixal *-ingtun* might or might not affect the vowel of the base. The first element of *Elston* (pp. 212 f.) is best derived from ON *Ellifr*. The development of *Hawton* (p. 215) shows variation between the *au* and *ou*

diphthongs, but this is not infrequent; see my discussion, *MP.*, xx, 189 ff. The two forms *Frēna* (OE) and *Frāni* (ON) are surely unrelated. An OE mutated form cognate with ON *Frāni* would be **Frēna*, not *Frēna* (p. 255).

We will next take up five Swedish studies, all but one in the Old English field.⁷ Engblom's dissertation starts badly but ends well. He has, I think, made plausible his main contention: that the auxiliary *do* has two sources, the "pro-verb" for the emphatic use, the causative for the unemphatic use. He has brought together a large number of quotations which throw light on the history of the construction, and has made more precise the various stages of its development. The presentation of the material, however (especially in the first part of the book), might be greatly improved. The author rambles rather than marches, and it is not always clear what conclusions (if any) he has come to. Ivar Dahl's dissertation is an unusually able and illuminating piece of work. It falls into three chapters: (1) dates and localization of the early OE sources; (2) presentation and etymological discussion of the inflexional material; and (3) the development of the inflexional endings during the early OE period. The study is confined to the vowel stems of the noun inflexions, but a second volume is promised which will be given over to the consonant stems. Dahl's first chapter will perhaps be more generally used than any other part of his book; among other things, it gives us a useful though not exhaustive list of the OE inscriptions. The following comments may be made on various details. The *Speculum* text of *Cædmon's* hymn, MS. L (p. 3), is inferior to that given by Dobbie.⁸ For the text of *Bede's* Death Song (p. 15), see also Dobbie, p. 55. Girvan's date for the composition of *Beowulf* (p. 48) is too early and should not be taken as authoritative. About half the cases of *-n* for *-m*

⁷ *Lund Studies in English*, ed. E. Ekwall (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup), Vols. vi (1938), vii (1938) and viii (1939); *Nomina Germanica*, ed. J. Sahlgren (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell), Vols. iv (1938) and vii (1940). The volumes of 1938 were received too late for inclusion in our previous survey. LSE vi: *On the Origin and early Development of the Auxiliary Do*, by Victor Engblom, pp. 171; LSE vii: *Substantival Inflexion in early OE*, by Ivar Dahl, pp. xvi + 206; LSE viii: *OE Personal Names in Bede's History*, by Hilmer Ström, pp. xlv + 181; NG iv: *OE Bynames*, by Gösta Tengvik, pp. xxii + 407; NG vii: *Genitival Composition in OE Place-Names*, by Erik Tengstrand, pp. lxviii + 354.

⁸ E. V. K. Dobbie, *MSS of Cædmon's Hymn and Bede's Death Song*, p. 17.

may be examples of sandhi (p. 55, 72, 94, 113, 116, 134, 152, 156, 167). The late OE spelling *westennu* (p. 94) probably reflects the simplification of double consonants in unstressed syllables; in other words, it is a purely orthographical variant of *westenu*. The author is mistaken when he tells us (p. 99) that the stem **gauja-* is recorded in OE only "in the position of latter element of compound place-names." It appears also in the personal name *Wudga* or *Widia*; see the discussion in my edition of *Widsith*, pp. 198 f. In the discussion of the stem **aujō-* likewise (p. 102), the tribal names *Eowum* and *Gefft-Egum* of *Widsith*, and the island name *Eowland* of Alfred's *Orosius*, should be considered; see my paper in *SP.*, xxviii, 577 f., and the appropriate articles in my *Widsith* glossary. I have noted a misprint on p. 146.

Hilmer Ström's dissertation falls into a longish introduction and three parts. Part I is etymological, Part II phonological, and Part III lexical. There is also an 11-page bibliography. The introduction includes "a short description of Bede's life and work, an account of the main MSS of the Hist. Eccl., and a survey of OE personal names in general" (p. xxi). In the first part each name-element is given an etymology or the various possibilities are considered. In the second part Bede's sound-system is set forth historically, the various sounds occurring in the material being traced back to West Germanic. In the third part the personal name-material is presented in alphabetical order, with biographical notes. The whole makes a useful book. Under EAN (p. 13) the ON name *Eymundr* might have been mentioned; see A. Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*, 4th ed., p. 221. On the name-element HUN (p. 24) see my ed. of *Widsith*, p. 170. The name *Oisc*, discussed on pp. 30, 73 f. (cf. also p. 70), need not have been taken up in two places. On this name, see now E. Ekwall, *English Studies* xxiii 87. Ing (p. 52) is not well described as an "Anglo-Frisian tribal hero." The Danes, according to *Beowulf*, were *Ingwine* 'friends of Ing,' and they can hardly be reckoned Anglo-Frisians. Under BETTI (p. 64) the corresponding Continental forms should have been referred to; see my paper in *Englische Studien* lxxiii 182. In support of Ekwall's etymology of *Offa* (p. 73) it may be noted that this etymology would make the fourth century *Offa*'s name alliterate with that of his father *Wærmund*. Under UITTA (p. 78) the *Witta* of *Widsith* 22 might have been mentioned. The author on p. 145 refers to my discussion of *Moidum* in my ed. of *Widsith*, but fails

to give a reference to my much fuller (and later) discussion in *Anglia* LXI 114 ff. Under UODEN (p. 180) the author neglects to point out that the East Saxon kings did not claim descent from Woden. I have noted misprints on pp. 93 and 130.

Tengvik's dissertation is "a systematic inquiry into the OE bynames found in OE sources from c. 700 to c. 1100 (including Domesday Book). No similar work has so far been attempted" (p. 1). The author's chief interest, like that of previous students, is in the light which the bynames throw on the origins and history of the surnames of later times. The book is a weighty contribution to the study of surnames. Its chief value, however, is as a list of early bynames. In extremely few cases has the author succeeded in proving that a given byname was inherited by a given man from his father; in other words, nearly all the bynames listed were still in the byname stage. Their transmutation into surnames came later. Nevertheless, the author in a few cases has been able to catch the beginnings of this important development. The following matters of detail seem worthy of comment or correction. The names of the Kings of Kent did not "begin with a K" (p. 12). The section on "multiplicity of bynames" (pp. 22 f.) does not raise the question which is bound to occur to the reader: are these local and official designations really bynames at all? Nowadays one might perfectly well refer in writing to So-and-so of New York without a thought that *New York* was the byname of the person referred to. Why should such a reference be interpreted differently in a medieval document? If a given person were identified regularly as the New Yorker or the judge, we might then have a right to say that *New Yorker* or *Judge* was his byname, but this regularity can hardly be presumed without repeated references to him in these terms in the records. Such repetitions are so rare in OE records that the presumption which the author seems to make can hardly be justified. Under "antedated words" (pp. 23-27) the author makes claims which must strike many readers as extravagant. For instance, the word *bigot* is recorded in the *NED* from 1598, but the byname *Bigot* appears in 1086, more than 500 years earlier. The author explains such gaps as follows: "words that belong to the popular idiom do not usually appear in literature until they have been long in colloquial use, and it is in the nicknames recorded in official documents that pre-literature instances are most likely to be found" (p. 24). This may possibly hold for some nicknames, but

it hardly explains the case of *bigot*. The Roger Bigot of DB did not get his nickname from English-speaking people but from Frenchmen, and we have no reason to think that the meaning of this nickname was understood by the English of his day; still less are we justified in concluding from the occurrence of this nickname that the common noun *bigot* was added to the English vocabulary in the eleventh century. Whether *Brito* (p. 133) means 'the Briton' or 'the Breton' depends, of course, on the origin of the person so named; it seems a bit unsafe to take for granted that in all cases it has the latter meaning. The derivation of the surnames *Burnage*, *Burnish*, *Barnish* from *Beorneges* (OE *Beornheah*) seems unsatisfactory (p. 151); *Barnish* offers the least difficulty, since here we need only suppose palatalization of the genitival -s, but even this sound-change would have to be reckoned dialectal. The nom. form would give the modern surname *Barney* without any phonological difficulties. The *Lwiuges sunu* of p. 159 (OE *Lyfing*) answers, again in the nom., to the modern surname *Liveing*. The forms *Goold*, *Gould* (p. 185) indicate lengthening of OE, not "ME *o* in front of *ld*." In *Paue filius* we have OE *pāwa* 'peacock' used as a nickname (p. 194), but this would give modern *Poe*, not *Paw*, unless the latter surname is of northern origin, while *Porson* has no place here. With *Roger* etc. (p. 196) should be mentioned *Hodge* and *Hodges* and possibly *Dodge* as well (though this name may be a dialectal variant of *Dodds*). It is odd that in the discussion of OE *Wynstān* (p. 203) the modern *Winston* was not mentioned. For *Scandinavianized* (p. 214) read *Anglicized*. The nickname *Malf* (p. 222) may be a contraction of *Mæðulf*. The entry *Scutarius* is wanting (p. 269). Latin *barbatus* (p. 290) by way of French would give *Barbee* (a not unfamiliar English surname) but not *Barb*. French *Neir* 'black' (p. 293) gives the English surname *Neer*. The nickname *Spalla* (p. 335) may be connected with the OE tribal name *Spalde*. This connection seems preferable to that with a hypothetical OE personal name *Spalda* derived from *spald* 'spittle.' Latin *peccatum* by way of French would give the modern English surname *Peachy* but hardly *Peach* (p. 353). With *Calic* (p. 374) may be connected the *Cælic* of *Widsith*. I have noted misprints on pp. xi, 4, 147, 159, 167, 221, 356, 361.

Tengstrand's dissertation is modestly but rightly described by the author as "the first step . . . in an inquiry into the conditions

under which words not denoting persons entered in their genitival form into OE place-names, including names of boundary marks" (p. vii). The author's introduction is devoted chiefly (pp. xiii-lxi) to a historical sketch of the "genitive problem in English place-name study." He follows this sketch with a "plan of the present investigation" (pp. lxi-lxvii). The body of the work falls into two parts. The first part deals with two types of genitival constructions as found in boundary surveys and other place-name material: (1) the type *þæs clifes ende*, in which the article agrees with the genitive, and (2) the type *þone hundes þyfel*, in which the article agrees with the word on which the genitive depends. The second part is devoted to secondary compounds, such as *Holanbeorges tun*, where the genitive is itself a compound word. This part includes only the material for an investigation which is to be published separately under the title "Studies on Secondary Composition in OE Place-Names." The work as a whole, with its projected sequel, bids fair to be a contribution to place-name study of fundamental importance. Until the sequel appears the results of the investigation can hardly be evaluated, however. The following notes on a few details may be added. The gen. *burhges* (p. 29) differs markedly from such genitives as *dunes* and *dices*, since *dun* and *dic* occur with masc. as well as fem. inflexion, while *burg* is a noun regularly fem. On the *fæmnanþegn* of *Beowulf* 2059 (p. 92), see my recent discussion in *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown* (New York, 1940), pp. 13-18. In sec. 133 (p. 129) we are referred to a sec. 165b which the author seems to have finally decided not to include. The argument (p. 222) that "the repeated combination of the rare *Lutegares-* with *healh* precludes the inference of a personal name from the place-names" seems to me unsound. An individual named *Lutegar* may have been the hero of a story which included an episode in which the hero took refuge in a hollow or cave, or defended such a refuge against attack. Another source for the proper name *Secg* (pp. 259 f.) would be the tribal name *Secgan*, evidenced in *Finnsburg* and *Widsith*. I have noted misprints on pp. xlix, li, lvii, 33, and a grammatical slip on p. xxxvii.

In the year 1935 Professor Ernest Weekley announced his book *Something about Words* as a positively last appearance. In 1940, however, he presents us with another sprightly tour of the nominal

realm,⁹ offering as his excuse "that the leisure of retirement craves for some innocent amusement and that none appeals to me so much as the hunting down of words and names" (p. ix). His new book is welcome. It is done in his usual manner, and, needless to say, makes interesting reading. It also carries the usual Weekley complement of mistakes. The *Marion* in the name of Francis Marion Crawford, the American novelist, is not a female name (p. 8) but a surname; Crawford was named after the Revolutionary hero, General Francis Marion. The German name-element *bern* is properly identified with OE *beorn* 'man, warrior, prince' but we have no reason to think (pp. 29, 43) that it differed in meaning from *beorn*, whether ON *bjorn* 'bear' is to be connected with *bern* and *beorn* cannot be said with certainty. Has the Venerable Bede ever been canonized (p. 30)? OE *Wigstan* reappears as a Christian name of the contemporary poet, Wystan H. Auden (p. 37). The name-element *hun* (p. 42), if related to Ger. *Hune* 'giant,' is to be connected with Celtic *cuno-* 'high' and with the word *high* itself; applied to a person it would thus mean 'the high one, the prince or ruler.' Connexion with the name of the Huns seems quite unlikely. The names *Hugh* and *Fulk* need not be shortenings of compound names (p. 44). ON *Hámundr* undoubtedly is cognate with OE *Heahmund*; Weekley's "perhaps" (p. 45) is, for once, unduly cautious. The following etymological gem (p. 48) needs no comment other than a series of exclamation points: "Arthur, of which so many interpretations have been given, seems to be simply the ON. Arnthor." The second element of *Edith* (p. 54) is neither mysterious nor Norse; it is OE *-gyð*, a jō-stem variant of the ð-stem *guð* 'battle.' *Elliot* (p. 56) is commonly connected with ON *Algauti* or *Algautr*, not with the Hebrew *Elias*. The derivation of *Tristan* (p. 58) rivals that of *Arthur*: "it is quite possibly a corruption of the Teutonic Thurstan." *Hans* (p. 66) is from *Johannes*, not *Johann*. *Lochlann* is not from Old Norse (p. 121), but is the Gaelic word for Norway or Scandinavia. The Romans were not so bad as Weekley makes them (p. 122); *Carac-tacus* is a misspelling of *Caratacus*, not of the much later *Caradoc*. *Horsa* does not mean 'mare' (p. 134). The name *Della* (p. 150) seems to be an aphetic form of *Adela*; the form presupposes that

⁹ *Jack and Jill, A Study in our Christian Names*, New York, Dutton, pp. xii + 193, \$1.50.

Adela was given penultimate stress, perhaps under the influence of its French cognate *Adèle*.

Professor Hutson's onomastic study¹⁰ would have been easier to use if it had been cast in dictionary form; as it is, one must look up a name thrice: first in the index, then in the text, and last in the notes (if there is a note on it). The author describes his method as follows (pp. 1 f.): "to list each name in the order in which it occurs in the *Historia*; to list every relevant occurrence of the name elsewhere . . . , to determine, as far as possible, the manner in which the name reached Geoffrey; and finally, where it seems necessary, to determine the actual or immediate source of the name." The author's chief interest seems to have been this determination of Geoffrey's source; he rarely includes any etymological discussion. The work has been carefully done and must be reckoned successful, though of course incomplete, since in many cases the source from which Geoffrey drew a given name cannot be determined. *Iago* (p. 13) is presented as "the only close parallel" to *lagon* (in the list of the children of Ebraucus). The author evidently means that the *l* of *lagon* is best explained as a mistake for *I*. This use of the term "parallel" is quite exceptional, and, in my opinion, unfortunate. The name of Ignogin (p. 16), daughter of Ebraucus, is not discussed; presumably the author identifies the name with *Innogen*, discussed on p. 8, and in the index *Ignogin* actually appears under *Innogen*, with a reference to pp. 16 and 104. On the latter page the name *Ignogin* does not appear, but *Innogen* does. It would have been better to make this identification in the text. On p. 21 (bottom) *Stadudud* is silently emended to *Stadud*. A close phonetic though not graphic parallel to *Ebrem* (p. 22) is the Hebrew *Ephraim*, which might well have had a spelling *Ebrem* in the Middle Ages. Under *Arturus* (p. 63) the author departs from his usual practice of ignoring etymology, though he enters upon no etymological discussion. He remarks, "the name is probably Celtic," and we have a right to infer that he rejects the connexion with the Latin *Artorius*. When he adds, "the Irish form of the name is Art," we learn that he connects Arthur's name with a well known Indo-European word meaning 'bear.' This hoary connexion

¹⁰ A. E. Hutson, *British Personal Names in the Historia Regum Britanniae*, Univ. of Calif. Publications in English, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. iv + 160, Berkeley, 1940, \$1.50.

belongs to the pre-scientific stage of etymological study, and has no proper place in a serious work of today. It is hard to understand the observation (p. 81) that "another of the British names, Patricius, is ordinarily associated with Ireland, not Britain," since everybody knows that St. Patrick was a Briton. Equally strange is the statement that "Geoffrey provides her [i.e. Ronwen, the daughter of Hengist] with a very plausible" name (p. 92). What is plausible about this very un-Germanic name? One must wonder also at the author's dictum (p. 95) that "the twentieth century is not much less credulous than the twelfth."

Professor Alexander has written an admirable short history of the English language.¹¹ He knows the subject and knows how to express himself in the tongue of which he writes, a combination not always found. A few matters of detail, however, stand in need of clarification or correction. The analytical or etymological pronunciation of *forehead* (p. 3) is still a vulgarism, I think; certainly it is not nearly so prevalent as the author supposes. The remark about the subjunctive on p. 14 should be qualified by reference to the discussion on p. 186. It is a serious heresy to put Old English and Latin at the same stage of linguistic evolution (p. 29). Latin belongs to the stage or level of Germanic, while OE represents a stage about midway between Germanic and modern English. Such combinations as *wr*, *kn*, *gn* are not properly called double consonants (p. 47). The author wrongly implies (p. 49) that *f* was normally used for *v* in Middle English; this use may be found after the OE period, of course, but by the fourteenth century *v* was the rule. For *Man* (p. 51) read *Mann*. The strong inflexion of verbs goes back to IE times (p. 57 footnote) and is therefore older than the weak inflexion, which does not antedate Germanic times. The word "curious" (p. 62) is unfortunate here. It is by no means certain that *call* (p. 69) is a Scand loan-word. The form *kirk* is hardly explicable (p. 70) as a Northern dialect form. The statement (p. 74) that OE had a word for uncle implies that OE had no words for aunt, nephew, niece, cousin and the like, though the author naturally intended no such absurd implication. In like manner the statement about the use of *th* in ME (p. 83) might well give an unwary reader the wrong impression. Chaucer's *neer* (p. 89) means 'nearer,' not 'near.' It is hardly right to say that

¹¹ H. Alexander, *The Story of our Language*, pp. x + 242, Toronto and New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1940, \$1.40.

OE *faran* is weak in Chaucer (p. 89). In fact, Chaucer uses OE *faran* in the present and in the past participle, but OE *fēran* (a weak verb) in the preterit. 'Better' is not a literal translation of *levere* (p. 91). Word frequencies cannot safely be presumed in terms of etymology (p. 106); many foreign words are of frequent, many native words of infrequent occurrence. OE *ceorl* meant 'freeman,' not 'laborer' (p. 137). The pronunciation of *figure* with [j] is general in the U. S., whereas *column* has [j] only in newspaper parlance and, no doubt, in some dialects. The two words therefore should not be lumped as the author lumps them (p. 178 f.). *Dive* (from OE *dǣfan*) has always been a weak verb (p. 188); it owes the form *dove* to the analogy of *drive* and the like. The OE strong verb *dūfan* has died out. *Clever* 'amiable' (p. 221) was widespread throughout the U. S. in the nineteenth century, though rare nowadays. Karl Verner (p. 229) was a Dane, not a German. I have noted misprints on pp. 43, 110, 207.

Professor Myers has written a book somewhat unusual in matter and purpose.¹² It falls into 20 chapters and five appendices. The first four chapters are devoted to the nature and origin of language, to definitions of linguistic terms, and to the Indo-European linguistic group. The next four chapters take up the history of English: an introductory chapter and one chapter each for Old, Middle and Modern English. Chapter 9 (pp. 65-82) is called "Greek Lessons" and serves as a highly abbreviated beginners' textbook in Greek. The knowledge of Greek gained by study of chapter 9 is used, in the next chapter, in the elucidation of Grimm's Law. Chapter 11 (pp. 89-108) is called "Latin Lessons" and introduces the student to the Latin language. Chapter 12 gives information about vulgar Latin and its offshoots the Romance languages. This information is then applied, in the next chapter, to English loanwords from these languages. Chapter 14 reverts to Greek; the Greek suffixes used in English are given special attention. Chapter 15 deals chiefly with English prefixes and suffixes of native origin. The headings of the last five chapters are: 16, Changes in Meaning; 17, Slang; 18, Synonyms and Rhetorical Devices; 19, Language in Poetry and Language as Poetry; 20, The Uses of Language. In Appendix A, various grammatical terms are defined and illustrated; in Appendix B, the languages of the earth are classified; in Appen-

¹² E. D. Myers, *The Foundations of English*, Macmillan, New York, 1940, pp. xxii + 301, \$3.

dix C are given lists of Greek words with English loans derived from them; in Appendix D the Latin material is given similar treatment; in Appendix E other foreign languages are touched upon in the same way. The book as a whole approaches English in terms of its linguistic setting through the centuries. Such an approach was worth trying out. Unluckily the author depends too much on inferior sources of information, and the quality of what he writes suffers accordingly. If he had used the *NED* instead of *Webster's* he would have been saved now and again from blunders and inconsistencies. Limitations of space keep me from listing here any of the mistakes in which the book abounds; suffice it to say that these mistakes are so many that the book cannot safely be put into the hands of a student.

The seventh edition of Kruisinga's well known handbook¹³ shows its author's mastery of the subject and ability to present the material clearly and systematically. No students' manual of comparable quality is available in English-speaking countries. Since the work is designed for Dutch students, it contains much that would be meaningless or needless here. It can be studied with pleasure and profit, nevertheless, by anyone interested in the subject. The author is in error when he says (p. 61) that "[u] is never followed by more than one non-syllabic sound in the same syllable," witness *looked*, *pulled*, *pushed*, *books*, etc. I have noted misprints on pp. 25, 72.

Three more Tracts of the Society for Pure English have reached us.¹⁴ Mr. Taylor's study of Charles M. Doughty is actually limited to the *Arabia Deserta*. The author's knowledge of Arabic here stands him in good stead. He shows in detail what Lascelles Abercrombie and others had felt and said but could not prove: that in style and vocabulary alike Doughty's English was highly Arabized. But the author does not stop here. He makes a systematic linguistic study of his subject, and gives us a treatise of unusual merit. He is wrong in thinking that *falling weather* is a coinage of Doughty's (p. 11); I have heard it all my life. For *philological*

¹³ E. Kruisinga, *An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds*, P. Noordhoff N. V., Groningen, 1940, pp. 218, f 3.00.

¹⁴ No. LI: *Doughty's English*, by Walt Taylor, 1939, pp. 46, \$1.25; No. LII: *Adjectives from Proper Names*, by R. W. Chapman, 1939, pp. 47-90, \$0.75; No. LV: *Slang*, by Eric Partridge, 1940, pp. 173-196, \$0.75. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford Univ. Press.

(p. 32) read *linguistic*. Mr Chapman's essay has an urbanity and polish worthy of the classicist that he is. He takes up a number of adjectival types and throws light on everything he touches. Of special interest is his account of the three pronunciations of Latin more or less used in England, an account needful as a preliminary to his study of adjectives derived from classical proper names. His rule III (p. 53), according to which a stressed antepenult is pronounced short, still applies to *ae* and *oe* in America, though no longer (it would seem) in England. Hence the [e] of *Aeschylus* and *Oedipus*. I note that the author writes *Vergil* (p. 53) but *Virgilian* (p. 85) with characteristic British inconsistency. In saying (regretfully) that *Herculéan* seems to have prevailed over the earlier and better *Hercúlean* (pp. 57 and 64) the author goes beyond the evidence; the *Concise Oxford* has only the latter form, and Jones gives it first place. In discussing adjectives of nationality the author manages to get in some neat digs: witness his *French leave* and *American neutrality* (p. 71). Under formations in *-er* he remarks that "*Edinburgher* is plausible but has perhaps never been used" (p. 73). Here the deficiencies of classical training reveal themselves; the plausibility is one of the eye, not of the ear. In America *Pittsburgher* is actually used, but the pronunciation of *-burgh* here differs from its pronunciation in *Edinburgh*. The author says (p. 80) that "the tale of *Aenéas* should properly be *Aenéid*, but this may be a late classicism." I think not; my father said *Aenéid*, and his pronunciation of Latin was the old-fashioned one still heard nowadays at Westminster school but (I suppose) nowhere else. Mr Partridge's study makes interesting reading, but does not measure up to the other two tracts. This for the reason that the author has already said his say elsewhere, and gives us nothing more here, though he tries hard enough. I would not contend, however, that the tract is without value. Our leading authority on slang wrote this sketch, and to students unfamiliar with the subject what he says will undoubtedly be worth while. The author is mistaken in saying that we Americans coined the term *deck* of cards (p. 195); this use of *deck* is recorded in the *NED* from the year 1593.

Miss Bryant and Mrs Aiken have written the stimulating book which their collaboration might be expected to produce.¹⁵ The

¹⁵ Margaret M. Bryant and Janet Rankin Aiken, *Psychology of English*, New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1940, pp. x + 229, \$2.50.

authors have keen, independent minds, and have thought long and much about the matters which they here take up. In their main contention—namely, that grammar is not a branch of logic but a pattern of human behavior—they are undoubtedly right. And their book is full of good things, said with vigor and point. They do not always weigh their words, however, and thereby fall into errors more or less serious. It is by no means safe to say (p. 7) that Mencken's *American Language*, 4th ed., represents the collection of more linguistic facts than have ever been assembled outside a dictionary. Have the authors never looked at H. Poutsma's *Grammar of Late Modern English*? The *ed* termination does not indicate future time in the example quoted (p. 26), as is evident from the fact that the time would still be future if the termination were dropped. It is far from evident (p. 38) that "so far as its grammar goes the [Chinese] language is today in a state similar to that which must have obtained in primitive speech." The causative *do* in the construction which the authors cite (p. 52) could never have given rise to the auxiliary; it was the construction with the simple infinitive (*NED* sec. 22a), not that with *to* plus the infinitive (*NED* sec. 22c) which led to the development of *do* as an auxiliary. The emphatic *do* goes back to an OE construction, and did not develop "subsequent to the Elizabethan period" (p. 53); see Engblom's dissertation, discussed above. Are the authors sure that "in the [1611 ed. of the] King James Bible *you* and *ye* are used . . . in the traditional fashion" (p. 55 and footnote)? If I mistake not, the first edition reflects the confusion of the day and the regularity was introduced later. The authors seem to forget (p. 56) Chaucer's sg. form *men* 'one.' The use of *different than* (p. 57) is rare in Britain but common in America. The authors imply (p. 58) that the present restriction of *who* to human beings is modern. In fact, of course, OE *hwa* was masc. and fem., OE *hwæt* neut., and this distinction naturally led to a ME restriction of *who* to human beings, since, after grammatical gender was given up, almost the only masc. and fem. nouns left were those which denoted human beings. Indeed, the restriction of (interrogative) *hwa* to human beings goes back to OE. The history of the old gen. *hwæs* is more to the author's point. This gen., originally used in all genders, became dissociated from *hwæt* when its *æ* was replaced by the *o* of the masc. fem. form. The authors are also mistaken in saying that "by ME the words *as* and *also* were clearly differen-

tiated" (p. 58). In the Reeve's Prologue, line 3870, Chaucer uses *also* in the sense 'as.' The construction *you was* (p. 64) goes back to the common eighteenth century practice of using *was* with *you* sing., *were* with *you* pl. The word "clearly" (p. 66) is hardly justified; for a different explanation of what is happening to the predicate nom. construction after the verb *be*, see *MLN.* XLVI 427 f. The preservation of the form *an* is due to force of tradition, not to "indolence" (p. 68). In such constructions as *these kind* (p. 69) it seems natural to presume that the historically correct plural form *kind* here survives. *Normans* would be a better example than *Germans* (p. 78) of the -s plural of -*man* compounds, since the word *German* is not a -*man* compound. The explanation given by the authors (p. 83) for "the opposition to *fix*" is by no means so certain as they seem to think. Is *allow* 'concede' (p. 84) bad English? And if the authors are talking about *allow* 'suppose,' is the construction *I'll allow* in use? One would expect *I allow*. Such expressions as *thus die* and *a falling cadence* (p. 94) are hardly colloquialisms. *Enac his cynryn* is not from *Orosius* (p. 98 footnote) but from *Numbers* 13, 29 (28); the proper reading, moreover, is *Enachis cynryn* 'Enoch's children'—*Anak* seems to have been confused with *Enoch*, as the spelling shows. The passage from *Orosius* (p. 98) is inaccurately quoted and interpreted. It reads (ed. Sweet, p. 8): *Affrica and Asia hiera landgemircu onginnað. . . .* With this is to be compared the beginning of the preceding paragraph: *Europe hio onginð. . . .* Note also the quotation which the authors give elsewhere (p. 175) from Shakespeare: *My brother he is in Elysium*. The statement (p. 99) that "during ME the *es* case ending was extended by analogy . . . to the plural and to all singulars" is inaccurate on two counts: (1) we cannot be sure that the *es* of the gen. pl. came from the sg.; (2) the *es* ending was not extended to all gen. sg. forms—note Chaucer's *lady grace* 'lady's grace.' The use of *expect* for *suspect* (p. 103) is explicable as a mere confusion of words, an example of malapropism. The use of the present tense in a future sense (pp. 103, 107) goes back to OE times. It is hardly right to say (p. 110) that "it is an accepted rule in phonetics that sounds influence the sounds which precede rather than those that follow them." Witness *mill* from earlier *myln*. The *going to* forms are not "distinctively American" (p. 114). OE *ic* was pronounced like the modern *itch*, not like German *ich* (p. 142). The etymology of *welsh*

vb. which the authors take for granted (p. 145) is exceedingly dubious. For an OE example of "substitution or circumlocution" (p. 152) to avoid using the imperative, see *Beowulf* 344-7. The notion that the "courtly style" came in with the Normans is really unworthy of the authors, who must have read *Beowulf* at least, in spite of their amazing statement (p. 162) that Lindsay's *Congo* is "roughly equivalent in literary type to *Beowulf*." Shakespeare's *oft* is no abbreviation of *often* (p. 163) but goes back to OE times. The footnotes on p. 172 show an astonishing lack of information about current British usage. The expression *would better* (p. 200) seems to have been a coinage of W. S. Landor; so far as I know, it has never established itself in living English usage. It is not true that classical Latin "had one tense, and only one, for the expression of a given time relationship" (p. 204). It is wrong to say (p. 207) that the proposed "before-present" division of time "does exactly correspond to the present perfect tense of English." On p. 209 the authors themselves give as an example of the perfect the sentence *I have lived here six years*, where the perfect, far from being "before-present," actually includes present time.

Miss Ball's book is the best thing in print on the subject with which it deals.¹⁶ In it the author is concerned to find valid rules which will guide the perplexed writer who so often does not know whether to write two words or one, and if he settles upon the latter, is still doubtful about whether or not to use a hyphen. The subtitle of the book indicates its scope: "A comparative review of variant authorities with a rational system for general use and a comprehensive alphabetic list of compound words." The author's historical and critical survey of previous opinion is full and acute. Her system, which has been adopted by our Department of State and incorporated in its Style Manual, is worthy of general adoption. Usage is still fluid in this matter of compounding, and needs guidance towards simplicity and consistency, a guidance which Miss Ball's book can furnish to the satisfaction of all who are not content with the present uncertainty and would welcome some rational regulation.

The revised edition of the first volume of the series, *American*

¹⁶ Alice M. Ball, *Compounding in the English Language*, New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1937, pp. x + 226, \$2.50.

Speech Reprints and Monographs,¹⁷ brings together an interesting assortment of reprints from the pages of the journal *American Speech*. The new edition is twice the size of the old. The transcriptions here reprinted were originally published in vols. VIII to XIV of *American Speech*. The volume was prepared for the use of students and teachers of phonetics, English pronunciation, and the like. The items fall into five groups: (1) specimens of acceptable American English, (2) broadcasts by Americans, (3) transcriptions of phonograph recordings of the story "The Rat," (4) transcriptions of miscellaneous recordings, and (5) specimens of British English.

Professors Eliason and Davis have collaborated in an investigation¹⁸ which breaks new ground. As the authors tell us (p. 5), "any investigator of historical linguistics—and especially of that branch which deals with sound changes—recognizes that the historical evidence must, when possible, be supplemented by and checked with modern phonetic evidence." In the past, however, for reasons which we need not go into here, this recognition has not led to collaboration between experimental phoneticians and linguistic historians. The present study presents the results of such a collaboration. The historical problem investigated was the quantitative changes that took place in Old and Middle English times in dissyllabic words with open penults (i. e. penults ending in a vowel). More precisely, since we know what quantitative changes took place, the investigation was concerned with the theories which have been advanced to account for these changes. The investigation was further limited to words in which the ultima begins with a single consonant. The experimental evidence indicates that a light stress on the ultima has the effect of shortening a long vowel of the penult, or of preventing the prolongation of such a vowel if it is short to start with. Hence ME *nāme* but *body*. For further details the reader is referred to the study itself, which may well prove a landmark in phonological investigation.

¹⁷ *Phonetic Transcriptions from "American Speech,"* edited by Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1939, pp. xii + 83, \$1.60. The first edition came out in 1936.

¹⁸ Norman E. Eliason and Roland C. Davis, *The Effect of Stress upon Quantity in Dissyllables, An Experimental and Historical Study*, Bloomington, Indiana, 1939 (Indiana Univ. Publications, Science Series No. 8), pp. 56, \$1.

In my review of S. A. Leonard's *Current English Usage* I noted that "the volume is a summary of the views of certain chosen individuals, not a statement of the facts of current usage" (*MLN.* XLVIII 394). Marckwardt and Walcott have now taken up the items in Leonard's questionnaire, in an attempt to find facts rather than views.¹⁹ These facts were sought primarily in the *NED*; by way of supplement the 1934 edition of *Webster's*, Horwill's *Modern American Usage*, Hall's *English Usage* and the grammars of Jespersen and Curme were used. The general conclusion which the authors reach is that the judges in Leonard's survey of opinion were far more conservative than the facts of English usage warrant. This conclusion is undoubtedly right. The present investigation too, it must be added, errs on the conservative side. Thus, we are told (p. 16 footnote) that "to gather factual data concerning such unquestionably accepted expressions as *it is I* would be a work of supererogation." But this expression, in my opinion, should be classed as an archaism, inappropriate for contemporary conversation except in the mouths of the pseudo-refined. This brings me to another point. The sources of information which the authors use sometimes prove insufficient. Thus, the expression *feel badly* is recorded as dialectal, on the authority of the *NED* and *Webster*. But everyday experience teaches us that that is nonsense. The *NED* entry may be explained as out of date (it belongs to an early volume); for the *Webster* entry there is no excuse, but we may conjecture that the *NED* entry is its source. Obviously the authors should not have rested content with their absurd conclusion, but should have broadened the basis for their findings by including, say, Poutsma's grammar. Whether this grammar would yield material to the point I do not know, but authority after authority should have been searched for an up-to-date discussion. In the same way, search should have been made for an adequate treatment of the current use of *it is I*, though it is possible enough that nothing usable would have come of it. I wish the authors were right about the term *colloquial* (p. 19). But Eric Partridge, in the tract on slang reviewed above, uses it in the sense 'sub-standard' and a like use may be found in the *Dictionary of American English* now in progress. The artificiality of the authors' distinction be-

¹⁹ Albert H. Marckwardt and Fred Walcott, *Facts about Current English Usage*, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1938 (English Monograph No. 7, National Council of Teachers of English), pp. x + 144, \$0.90.

tween *literary* and *colloquial* comes out in their classification of *I've got to go* (p. 29) and *where are we at* (p. 49) as literary. The discussion of *Reverend Jones* (p. 49) seems one-sided; much is said about the omission of the article, but the omission of the Christian name is ignored. The authors' use of *archaic* departs too markedly from ordinary usage to be acceptable.

Professor C. C. Fries has done a distinguished piece of work in his *American English Grammar*.²⁰ The work, which he modestly describes as "a preliminary sketch of the inflections and syntax of American English" (p. vii), is based on letters written in the present century—more precisely, on "certain files of informal correspondence in the possession of the United States Government" (p. 26). On exclusively non-linguistic evidence the writers of these letters were divided into three groups: I upper class, II middle class, III lower class. To proceed in the words of the author, "the language used [in the letters] by Group I we have called *standard* English; that used by Group II, *popular* or *common* English; that used by Group III, *vulgar* English" (p. 32). Evidently we have here a basis for scientific objective grammatical study, and this study the author has made in masterly fashion. The work is so well done, indeed, that we can only hope that he keeps on with it, filling up the gaps and fortifying or modifying the conclusions as more material becomes available. A few comments follow on sundry details. The *-an* of the OE *n*-stems served, not for the plural number (p. 41), but for the nom. acc. pl. The form *are* is not "number distinctive" (p. 47) except in the first and third persons. Is the *were* of p. 52 (line 20) a subjunctive? Some of the 66 verbs that remained strong can hardly be called common (p. 61); to the list of weak verbs which by analogy have developed strong forms should be added *dive* from OE *dyfan*; the verb *get* is not a two-form verb in American English, except in certain constructions. *Agree* (p. 71) is not a strong verb. Such forms as *hers* were formed on the pattern of *his*, not "on the pattern of the *s* genitive of nouns" (p. 80). For *waes* (p. 90; cf. p. 130) read *wæs*. To the percentages given on pp. 92-6 should be added the actual number of occurrences. Are such words as *nethermore* (p. 96) comparatives? Or does *nethermore* mean 'nether' much as *forevermore* means

²⁰ National Council of Teachers of English, *English Monograph No. 10*, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1940, pp. xii + 313, \$2.50.

'forever'? So far as I can see, *more* here is intensive rather than comparative. The OE verb distinguishes the persons in the singular only, and even here this distinction is confined to the indicative, and is complete (i. e., takes in all three persons) in the present only. The author's statement of the case (p. 101) does not bring out these facts. In Table IX (p. 103) it would be instructive to know how these figures would be affected by isolating the instances of the verb *be*. The formulation "case forms for the genitive and dative-accusative of substantives" (p. 109) is not satisfactory: nouns and pronouns ought to be separated, and the special position of pronominal inflexion ought to be recognized. Under function words (p. 110) one misses the usual historical sketch, which would be particularly illuminating here. Why not *use* (p. 143, g)? Or, if *used*, why not *got* (p. 143, e)? The *will* of p. 166, line 13 is not future, but has a modal sense; compare the *would* of p. 178, line 10. OE *mosten* (p. 173) is best rendered 'be permitted.' The absence of *maybe* from the letters of Group I (p. 181) indicates that these letters were written in a formal style, as indeed one would expect in governmental correspondence. The term *intensifiers* (p. 204) is not happy, since the words so named are often weakeners rather than strengtheners, witness "*fairly* accurate." *Like the others* (p. 225) is not a clause. I have noted misprints on pp. 57, 257.

Professor Leopold has made an exceptionally good study of the first stages of child speech.²¹ His book is based on his own notes, and these represent his observations of his daughter Hildegard's linguistic behavior from birth to the age of two years. His subject differs from the usual American child chiefly in that from the beginning she has had a bilingual environment; both German and English were spoken in her home. The present study is devoted almost wholly to "vocabulary growth in the first two years." The linguistic history of the child's first year is given in a connected narrative (pp. 16-29). Then comes an alphabetical list of the words used up to the age of two (pp. 30-139). Each word is transcribed phonetically; the transcription is followed by its conventional form, English or German (or both) as the case may be, and by a full discussion of changes in pronunciation and meaning dur-

²¹ W. F. Leopold, *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child*, Northwestern Univ. Studies in the Humanities No. 6, Evanston, 1939, pp. xiv + 188, \$2.25.

ing the period under study. Next comes an index to the vocabulary (pp. 140-148). The final section (pp. 149-179) is called "word-count and analysis of vocabulary." By way of appendix we are given (1) a five-page section called "sketches" in which the child's general development and linguistic development are summarized in parallel columns, and (2) a four-page bibliography. On the titlepage we read "A Linguist's Record, Volume I," and infer that further material from his notes will be worked up for inclusion in other volumes, dealing, presumably, with later stages of Hildegard's linguistic development. The present volume is especially welcome because competent studies of the first two years of a child's linguistic life are so rare.

We turn now to works of a more general character. Some ten years ago Mr. A. H. Gardiner published a book on the theory of speech and language (see *MLN.* XLVIII 396). In his present work he continues these theoretical studies.²² His main contention is brought out in his definition (p. 39): "a proper name is, then, a word which identifies its object by virtue of its sound alone." For instance, a girl named *Rose* is identified by stripping the word *rose* of any "meaning" which it may have for us and using it as a mere sound-label, arbitrarily associated with an individual object. The difficulties involved in this definition are many, and the author struggles valiantly and amusingly with them over many pages of beautifully printed text. His study is enlivened, besides, with a vigorous and (to my mind) successful attack on Bertrand Russell's theory of proper names. The author has by no means solved the difficult problem which he so gaily tackles, but his essay is distinctly worth reading. President J. J. Callahan gives us another volume on linguistics, a volume not unlike his earlier contribution in point of view and method of approach, but broader in scope and (I should think) wider in appeal.²³ In urging the importance of word study the author does not stand alone, but he shows no signs of contact with the cult of semantics so active nowadays. On the contrary, he goes back to the classics, pagan and Christian, and builds on foundations tested by time. Professor Gray has written

²² *The Theory of Proper Names, A Controversial Essay*, New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1940, pp. 67, \$1.75

²³ *Science of Language*, vol. II, *Word Study*, Duquesne Univ Press, Pittsburgh, 1939, pp. vi + 274 + xi. The first volume of this work was reviewed in *MLN.*, LIV, 540.

a comprehensive survey of linguistic science.²⁴ His point of view is historical and comparative, and he seems not to have been influenced by the descriptive technic fashionable nowadays. The work shows great erudition but also reveals serious gaps of one sort and another. The following comments may prove useful in indicating some of the weaknesses of the book. On p. viii we read, "the standard adopted throughout for the pronunciation of English is that of the public schools in Southern England." This seems out of place in an American book, but need not be a weakness if lived up to. Unluckily the author did not sufficiently acquaint himself with the standard which he adopted, witness the distinction made (p. 62) between *address* noun and verb. The author follows British rather than American spelling, too. That is his privilege, but when he proceeds to justify his choice in terms of etymology (pp. viii, 348), one can only shake one's head. His etymology of *catechize* (p. viii) is wrong; see *NED*. Afrikaans is not properly described (p. 37) as "a mixture of African vocabulary with . . . Dutch grammar." The clicks are made with suction rather than inhalation (p. 45). English [j] is not a fricative (p. 50). The pronunciation of *did you* as [dɪdʒu:] is not vulgar (p. 53). The *u* of *F lui* is not properly described as "the voiced counterpart of [j]" (p. 54). The essential element of [t] is not "the explosion following the breaking of the contact" (p. 61). If it were, one would expect a long explosion in the continuant [t] of Swedish, Italian and other languages, whereas in fact it is the stoppage which is long. Moreover, if the explosion were the essential feature, the [t] made without this feature would lack its essential element—an absurd conclusion. The essential element of [t] is, of course, the stoppage, and such sounds are properly called stops, not "plosives." The author's faulty analysis of the stop invalidates his discussion on p. 53 (cf. also p. 57). *Mister* is not a weakened form of *Master* (p. 65). The hypothetical English forms *chorn* and *churn* (p. 68) and *fi* (p. 69) are inexact. German *Bein* is not an example of diphthongization (p. 71). English *two* obviously corresponds to German *zwei* (if one goes by the spelling), but its relationship to OHG *zwâ* and Latin *duo* (p. 76) is far from obvious. The author's statement (p. 76) that "it is possible to proceed from a voiced

²⁴ Louis H. Gray, *Foundations of Language*, New York, Macmillan, 1939, pp. xvi + 530, \$7.50.

plosive [d] to a fricative [ð] . . . , to an affricate [ts], and finally to a voiceless plosive [t]" seems to mean that IE [d] might have become Gmc [t] by way of [ð] and [ts]. If this is in fact what the author means, I must disagree with his conclusion that "it is fair to assume that such was the actual process" (p. 76). It is wrong on more counts than one to say that the original [d] of *father* and *mother* "has been changed to [θ] on the analogy of the regular [θ] in *brother*" (p. 78). The author confuses the facts and the "laws" of Grimm and Verner, for the reader at least, on p. 82 top. Grimm's attempt to bring the Gmc and High German consonant shifts into a single formula has too long muddled the waters, and it is high time for his "law" to vanish from the books. The term *Low Teutonic* has different meanings on pp. 82, 120, 129 and 349. The author's statement of Mendel's Law (p. 84) would have horrified Mendel. It is risky to affirm (p. 102) that the *Æsir* were older than the *Vanir*. English *hall* (p. 104) is not from French. *Neither* (p. 107) is a contraction of *ne* and *either*. The pret. 3d sg. *found* (p. 108) goes back to OE *funde*. For *meed* (p. 110) read *mead*. The form *whole* (p. 112) is dialectal, not analogical in origin. OE *stræt* (p. 126) was taken from Latin before the English migrated to Britain. The discussions of *street* (p. 130) and *pole* (p. 131) are unsatisfactory. The author's interpretation of the effects of the Norman Conquest (p. 138) cannot be accepted. Euphuism is hardly pathological (p. 140). For *plosive* (p. 149) read *fricative*. It is hardly right to call an imperative sentence like *stop!* elliptical (p. 166). What makes the author think that German *Götter* is neuter (p. 187)? Instead of the unfamiliar *Efik* (p. 198), Icelandic might have been cited as a language where the adj. precedes while the gen. follows its noun. The sg. of the strong adj. had in OE a special inst. form (p. 199). Acc. and voc. coincide in certain Gothic declensions, but not elsewhere in Gmc (p. 202). For *Scandinavian* (p. 218) read *German*. On p. 256 the author says, "from OFr *corone*, in the reign of William the Conqueror, ME borrowed *coroune* . . . , ModE *crown*." This is all wrong; for the facts, see *NED*. The word *fee* (p. 259) is from OFr *fé* 'fief.' Icelandic *hestr* (p. 269) is as superlative as OE *hengest*. The story of the linguistic struggle in Norway (p. 346) is inaccurately told. The origin of Anglo-Frisian (p. 346) is wrongly explained. For *Thames* (p. 346) read *Firth of Forth*. For *Teutonic* (p. 349, line 3) read *High German*. Delete *and Saxon* (p. 349, line 5). From

his list of etymological works on English (p. 352) the author has omitted the two which he ought to have put at the head: the *NED* and H. C. Wyld's *Universal Dictionary*. I have noted misprints on pp. 234, 263, 346, 352.

KEMP MALONE

REVIEWS

The Italian Language. By MARIO PEI. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 272.

"The purpose of this volume is to present in condensed form and with the modifications suggested by recent research the findings of D'Ovidio, Meyer-Lübke, Grandgent, and other linguists, and to adapt them to the ends of elementary and advanced instruction for classes in Italian linguistics in the colleges and universities of English-speaking countries." It may be said without hesitation that this goal, as set down in the opening lines of Professor Pei's book, has been fully attained: with a pedagogical skill unequalled in any work of this kind, the results of the scholarly endeavor in the field of Italian linguistics during the period 1860-1900 have been codified and the whole brought up to date (to a notable degree by the inclusion of Professor Pei's own research); the material is presented without the dryness characteristic of the Schwan-Behrens type of manual with its tedious lists, and the book looks toward general linguistics: this study of the Italian language, with its own peculiar traits, is at the same time a study of Language; in particular the connection between the phenomena in Italian and those of Latin and Indo-European is constantly kept in view (most welcome is Chart I showing "the place of Italian among the world's languages"). I know of no comprehensive work on any particular language destined for school usage which is so elegantly and so eloquently written and which at the same time is so filled with sound knowledge: an exception might be Dauzat's study on the history of the French language—save that this is less suitable for classroom usage. One must be particularly grateful for the painstakingly commented collection of texts illustrating the development of the language from Old Italic dialects to Vulgar Latin, to early Romance, to modern Italian dialects (though one may wonder why such popular Latin writings as those of Plautus and Petronius, foreshadowing Romance, were omitted); in this way the reader, instead of being offered only abstract rules, is enabled to witness the actual richness of living speech.

It is no fault of Professor Pei that his synthetic treatment of Italian linguistics had to be based so largely on the research of a past generation: there is no *corpus* of the teachings of Italian students of language of our own times (as there is in the case of French, Spanish, and even Rumanian). I have pointed out in *Indogerm. Forsch.*, I, 147 *seq.*, the extent to which Italian linguistics lags behind that of its sister languages, attributing this to the mutual isolation of trained linguists and philosophers of language. A Meyer-Lubke was in touch with the philosophical (positivistic) currents of his time; today those currents have changed, but there has taken place in Italy no integration of the 'purely linguistic' approach of the Ascoli and neogrammarian schools, with the 'idealistic' philosophy of language as voiced by such distinguished 'linguistic outsiders' as Croce and Vossler. (It is significant that in Pei's bibliography Vossler's name appears not at all; Fr. Schurr, who, with all his training as an explorer of dialects, yet owes so much to Vossler, is likewise not mentioned; Croce is referred to only as the author of the book on the Spanish language in Italy; my own "Ital. Umgangssprache" is listed under 'dialectology'!). Thus this book, dealing with Italian 'linguistics' must needs be a monument to positivistic teachings.

Though Pei himself has too critical a mind to endorse the whole of such teachings, there may be discerned one important tenet in his linguistic creed which stamps him as belonging to the positivistic school: ¹ he believes that phonology and morphology are the

¹ Curiously enough, the review of Pei's book by R. A. Hall, Jr., *Language*, xvii, 263, contains a criticism just the reverse: Pei, according to Hall, has failed because of his 'idealistic' philosophy. I must confess that, in reading Pei, I failed utterly to realize that his was supposed to represent idealistic philosophy. How is such basic disagreement between two reviewers of opposed creeds to be explained? Perhaps because Pei has made use of the terminology of idealistic philosophy without adopting its way of thinking; this could result in an ambiguity capable of being interpreted by 'idealists' as positivism, by 'positivists' as idealism.

But it must also be said that Mr. Hall resorts to sweeping statements that cover a lack of factual information (a weakness supposedly peculiar to 'idealists'), as, for example, when he says (p 267, note 13), in order to disparage the idealistic school in linguistics, that the connection between linguistic development and *Volksgeist* (so characteristic of this school) "is doubtless one of the reasons for the official governmental favor shown to this school in Italy and Germany." German "governmental favor" must mean, in connection with Fascist Italy, Nazi favor. I should like to ask Mr. Hall how he explains the fact that the adherents to the idealistic school in Romance are now refugees: Vossler himself departed from office in disgrace. And as for *Volksgeist* which he makes, by implication, so compatible with Nazism—nothing could be farther from truth since *Volksgeist* is an 'idealistic', *not* a 'positivistic' conception—it is an historical truth that had it not been for this idea of Herder and the Romantics there would be today no Romance and no Indo-European linguistics. That believer in *Volksgeist*, Jakob Grimm, he who discovered the law of *Lautverschiebung*—did he have an attitude "essentially negative in its refusal to analyse and formulate thoroughly the material studied"?

fundamentals of language development—and this belief leads him to identify history with pre-history. That is, since, in his words, “from a phonological and morphological standpoint the Italian language appears to have been fully formed, in practically its modern stages, by the thirteenth century,” his procedure has been to exclude from his book these later developments: for these are “more of a learned, stylistic and literary nature.” Any reader must wonder that a book entitled “The Italian Language” should be without a picture of the actual Italian of today: that seven centuries of the language should be dismissed and the greater part of the book given over to the transition from Latin to Italian. Indeed, “From Latin to Italian” (as Grandgent chose to name his own work) would have been a more appropriate title for this volume. That Pei, *qua* linguist, can disregard the developments of the later periods is perhaps to be explained by the general condition of linguistics in Italy; the professors of this science, still overawed by their model Ascoli, have not ventured (with the exception of Migliorini) to tackle problems which a Brunot, Damourette-Pichon, and many others have dealt with for French. So Pei sees, after the ‘Golden Age’ only “learned, stylistic and literary influences”—only that ‘Geist und Kultur’ (to borrow a phrase of Vossler’s) which have made the Italian language the vehicle of the thought of Bruno, Galileo, Vico, Leopardi and Croce! The bitter satire which thirty years ago Gilliéron directed against his fellow scholars of French linguistics, concerned as they were then mainly with the infant stages of the language, still holds true today for Italian: “Balzac in his diapers is sitting in the lap of his wet-nurse. He wrote the *Comédie humaine*.” One may object that in the case of Italian the baby did write: it wrote the *Divina commedia*. But though this work reveals the Italian language at its most artistic, still the evolution which has taken place since the age of Dante has made the modern language, if not a finer, at least a different instrument—the exact nature of which the linguist cannot afford to leave unstudied. On the other hand, it is just as true that the language of Dante, likewise, is yet to be sufficiently studied: his style, syntax, and lexicology are still *terra incognita*.

Thus I can only feel that in assuming the basic identity of the two languages Professor Pei would identify two unknowns: two varieties of Italian which have in common mainly their phonological and morphological system. But to Pei it is the phonological and morphological facts which are basic; he sees no need to deal with any syntactical problems except those which can be treated under the heading of morphology: all the rest “belong to the realm of literary usage rather than to that of linguistic development.” Nor is any concern for literary usage necessary for the student of early popular Italian: “The spoken, spontaneous tongue of the masses, out of which the *Volgare* of the earliest Italian documents was evolved, is a simple, uninvolved structure.” This separation

of linguistics from literature which he would make, this denial of literary values for popular speech, is of course utterly un-Crocean—diametrically opposed to the Crocean teaching that language is poetry (which ‘equation’ Vossler has sought to recommend to linguists in *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, xix, 121 seq.). But not only does Pei fail to embrace the idealism of Croce: he is even more reactionary than the great Positivist Meyer-Lubke who, like Diez, included a *Romanische Syntax* in his grammar.

Indeed it was the revolutionary changes that took place in Romance syntax (for example, the new analytical structure) that, shaking the Latin language from top to bottom, brought about a new morphology, and probably (by the coinage of new tools for the expression of syntactical relations, together with the changes in accent—explained by Pei himself as a stylistic fact [p. 21]), a new phonology (the dropping of the -s etc.). To my mind any linguistic survey of any language should begin with stylistics (have not the masses a style of their own?),² then proceed to syntax (*nihil est in syntaxi quod non fuerit in stylo* has long been a contention of mine) and to lexicology, then to morphology and word-formation, and only at the end enter upon that branch which is the least diaphanous to the human mind, phonology. I am fully aware how little preparatory work has yet been done in Italian for such a program of ‘idealistic’ linguistics; but is this not precisely because Italian linguists have refused most stubbornly to look at language as it really is, disregarding the example of the most careful practical observer and yet the most ‘idealistic’ interpreter of linguistic change in early Romance that we have: Menéndez Pidal (who, in his “*Orígenes del español*,” was able to discern a Castilian, a Leonese, etc. style—even in phonology). As for the point made by Professor Pei that the ‘learned’ influences (so little deserving of scholarly interest) were supposedly at work more exclusively from the thirteenth century on, I fail to see how a period of language whose first texts include the *Indovinello Veronese* and the Monte Cassino Testimonial Formulas, and whose acme is Dante, can have been without ‘learned’ and ‘stylistic’ influences. In regard to the significance of these epithets there has come about (probably due

² To take just one example of a modern dialect (of Lucca) found in one of the texts cited (p. 209) in this work: “[though no one else has thought of entertaining you with an almanac] *ci ha penso* Brogio de Toccafondi, *ci ha penso*.” This repetition of *ci ha penso* [= *ci ha pensato*] is representative of popular style in many sections of Romance (cf. my *Aufsätze z. roman. Syntax u. Stilistik*, no 16)—as well as of English (“he thought about it, he did”). Here, however, the turn of speech seems clearly on the way to assuming the function of the French emphatic syntagm, now completely grammaticised, *c’est . . . qui* which, comparable to the dynamic accent in Germanic languages, allows SVO word order in French to continue unaltered. But this same *c’est . . . qui*, before being grammaticised, was originally a stylistic device to attract attention; *ci ha penso . . . ci ha penso* just cited stands at the brink between stylistics and grammar.

to the practice of bracketing the 'learned' forms in the REW) a misconception of language as sharply divided into 'pure' (popular) and 'impure' (learned) elements—a division which in actuality has never existed (the term 'Romance' itself is indicative of the fact that it was under the leadership of Latin that the early growth of the Romance languages took place). Several times Pei himself is forced to note how conservative is Italian (in comparison with other Romance languages) in preserving Latin features, and how indistinguishable at times in this very language are learned words from popular. The criterium 'learned' applies as much to the formative period as to the later ones of Italian.

Another step-child of our author is lexicology; according to him vocabulary is "the most unstable and unreliable, being subject to foreign and obscure influences far more than phonology or morphology and being, further, liable to drastic changes" (p. 119). What a willful severance is this of grammar from all that is living: the grammarian, a reactionary by nature, is encouraged to look with suspicion upon 'change and unrest'! As a matter of fact the 'obscure' influences to which vocabulary is susceptible can be much more easily traced back to cultural facts than can those affecting phonology and morphology.³ Pei goes on to object that "broad statements and classifications are more difficult in the realm of vocabulary than elsewhere"; of course they are difficult on the basis of the logical classifications of Wundt adopted by the author ('restriction'—'extension'—'outright change of meaning' [p. 127], 'abstract—concrete' [p. 118]); but why has he failed to take into account the 'law of the complexes' of Sperber and the 'field'-theory of Trier-Weisgerber, which combine to give us a system according to which the main interests, phobias and idiosyncrasies of an epoch would tinge *all* the words of the same semantic field? A marvelous opportunity to retrace the Christian, Germanic, and Byzantine influences, the influence of the life of the medieval communes (of the Renaissance, Counter-Reformation, Enlightenment, Romanticism etc. etc.) on Italian semantics has here been lost. Consequently the historical explanations offered in the section "Semantic change" (180) are the least trustworthy in this otherwise so scholarly book:

The word-history of *pravus* > *bravo*, if we accept Menéndez Pidal's hypothesis, cannot be traced in the abstract, on pseudo-logical grounds (i. e. the scoundrel has courage, thus he is brave; the brave man must have other good qualities, thus he is 'good'), it is necessary to take into account the concrete Spanish origin of the words: cf. such phrases as Sp. *toro*

³ This does not mean that morphological changes may not depend on lexicological changes; we have a clear case of this dependence with the pronoun of address *Lei* [= *Vostra Eccellenza*], which (obviously) lexicological and stylistic innovation has led to a confusion of agreement (*Lei è venuto* or *Lei è venuta*)—a confusion which is still unresolved in Italian (p. 87).

bravo 'evil bull' > 'infuriated bull'; *soldado bravo* 'infuriated soldier' > 'good soldier.'

The explanation *captivus* > *cattivo* "with the understanding, possibly (1) that only those who are bad are arrested" is quite amateurish: Meyer-Lubke and J. Jud have pointed out that *captivus* among the early Christian writers referred to man as a captive of the Devil, of Sin. This metaphor pervaded Romance languages; I have been able to attest sources from Provençal and Spanish as late as the fourteenth century (ZRP_h, LIV, 255).

cemento 'combat,' "the close interlocking of opposing forces, perhaps (1)"—No. cementing, as I have shown in *Arch. rom.*, XVII, 410, referred to a means of the chemists for assaying, purifying gold; hence 'ordeal' > 'combat.' There is no abstract method for explaining semantic change, words must be studied in their respective climates.

credenza 'cupboard,' "that to which things are entrusted" No. *credenza* was the sideboard (cf. Eng. *credence*, NED, s. v., 5-6) on which one assayed the food of princes to make sure that there was no poison in it: *fare la credenza* 14th c. (cf. Germ. *einen Trunk kredenzieren*; Sp. *hacer la salva*) How little interested is the Italianist in the cultural institutions of Italy!

It is only in the section dealing with word-formation that more modern developments are treated; here (§§ 178, 193 etc.) Pei gives passing references to the investigations of Migliorini—without, however, doing justice to the latter's concern with cultural roots. Thus brought in inorganically, the lists of modern colloquialisms (e. g. *pancia-fichista* 'pacifist') seem to me to discord with the Duecento atmosphere of the linguistic phenomena treated in this book.

In conclusion, I submit the following criticisms of miscellaneous details:

P. 38, instead of explaining -tā by haplology (*cittā[de] de Roma, bontā[de] de Deo*) I would suggest that the first step involved the dropping of the *d* (*cittae, bontae*); then, alongside these forms in *ae* the type *cittā, bontā* was introduced as hypercorrect (since there alternated with *ā, stā* etc. the [secondary] forms *ae, stae* etc.—representing what is called 'Murmelvokal'). P. 59, *hedera* > *ellera* has been convincingly explained by Schuchardt (ZRP_h, XXI, 33) as due to the interference of another plant name, *elena* (fr. *aunée*, Germ. *Alant*); in Isidore *inula. Tra(d)uce* > *tralce* is no more astonishing than are *sauma* > *salma, impa(c)tu* > *apalto*. P. 74, is not *padrone* the vocative form? Cf. such Sp. cases as *Sant-yague*. P. 80, is *ultimo* really a 'popular form'? P. 89, Ital. *chi* seems to me to represent not the result of a merger of *qui* and *quis*, but the one interrogative *qui?*, which was also used for the inclusive relative, as I have pointed out in RFA., III, 1 seq. P. 94, The replacement of the forms *amamo, vedemo, dormino* by the subjunctive form of 2nd and 3rd conjugation verbs (*capiamus, habeamus, faciamus*) which is here referred to is not explained; on p. 105 however we are told that the hortatory use of the subjunctive is involved in this change. But 'let us love' is not 'we love' It seems to me that we have to do with a stylistic use of the subjunctive of uncertainty (Lat. *dicat quispiam* 'somebody may say') as an expression of modesty: 'we may understand, have, do.' Forms of the first person are very likely to be rendered in a more modest arrangement; I have explained the Rumanian 1st pers. sing. as a plural *auctoris*, the Romance **dao, *stao* for *do, sto* as a future (*dabo = do* has been attested by Lofstedt). Cf. also popular French *on va = nous allons; tose, noi si*

va etc. P. 99, The tonic vowels in *ebbi*, *seppi* have not been given their diacritic signs, thereby the impossibility of their having been influenced by *debbi* (which was itself replaced by *dovei*, *dovetti*) is rendered less obvious. Why could there not have been an influence of *stetti*, *detti* etc? P. 108, *Noli facere, ne feceris (facias)* could not have had any bearing on Ital *non fare*, this represents a genuine stylistic use of the infinitive as a rougher way of giving orders—a phenomenon not unknown in other Romance tongues (the professor of Greek in my college at Vienna used to refer to this as a 'Fuhrmanns-imperativ'!) P. 110, The connotation of 'chance,' 'accident' should be emphasized in the case of *mi vien veduto*, this connotation is not shared by the parallel Rotoromance construction. P. 116, "Possibly a disregard of analysis appears in the case of adjectives used for adverbs: *veder chiaro, parlar forte*." Yes, but it should be stated that here we are dealing with the oldest layer of Romance adverbs, that preceded the analytical form, *parlar forte* = Lat *magnum clamare* = Eng. *to speak loud*, Germ. *laut sprechen*, literally = 'Lautes sprechen' P. 125, The type *spazzacamino*, at least, should be grouped with *calpestare, lunedì primavera*, all of them old compounds. P. 130, Why suggest the vague possibility of Etruscan influence on Ital. -etto, when Bruch (*Rev d'lingu. rom.*, II, 98) has so convincingly proved a Germanic origin? P. 134, *fifa* 'panic,' "a word of uncertain origin" But this is surely a dialect word which was used before the war, cf. the reviewer's *Die Umschreibungen des Begriffes 'Hunger' im Ital.*, p. 93; REW 3411 (the variants with *o-u-i*). P. 183, The *non mangiar ma' mezzo pane* with the missing *che* before *mezzo pane* is similar rather to O. Fr. *Francers ne parolent mais / Ganelun respunt* than to Sp. *no más que* P. 188, The derivation of *paradegu* from *παράδεχουαι* seems unlikely to me; the use of this Greek word would represent a hapax in Romance. The word is better explained as derived from *par-atium* 'what belongs to a pair' > 'what belongs to each member of a community.' P. 209, *Catrettoglie* 'ragazze dei borghi' is not explained; perhaps it belongs to *cutrettola*, which is attested in the form *cutretta* in the 14th-16th c.; cf. the form *catrémola* (*cauda*; *cau-* > *ca-*) in the thesis "Die Benennungen der Bachstelze" (Leipzig, 1933), by R. Hallig, p. 29.

In the bibliographical part the latest revision of the Stolz-Schmalz grammar (Leumann-Hofmann, 19) should be cited: Petrocchi and Rigutini-Bulle should not be listed among etymological dictionaries; among Elise Richter's writings her most important contribution, "Der innere Zusammenhang der romanischen Sprachen" should have been represented; there should also have been cited Ernout-Meillet's etymological dictionary of Latin, so important for Romance. Correct Brück to Bruch, Bahrens to Bährens.

LEO SPITZER

Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University.
 Edited by ALBERT FEUILLERAT. Decennial Volume. New
 Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. vi + 353. \$3.00.
 (Yale Romanic Studies, XVIII.)

This volume marks the conclusion of the first ten-year period in the life of its series. Scholars may well express the hope that there

will be many more periods of equal productivity. Seven articles are published here.

R. C. Bates traces the varying efforts to classify *le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* and concludes that it is a baroque epic, comparable in its curious diversity, which does not prevent unity of a certain sort, with an oriental rug. He adds notes on the text, offered to aid some future editor, who will publish the poem as a document that first appeared about 1155. P. A. Wadsworth contributes a "biographical sketch" of Marin Le Roy de Gomberville, in the composition of which he has made use of unpublished French material. His account of his author is interesting enough, and he clarifies the stages through which the *Exil de Polexandre* and *Polexandre* passed between 1619 and 1638. But he makes no effort to place Gomberville among seventeenth-century novelists, or to explain why he should have had as much fame as he did. He might with profit have consulted Professor Peyre, who recently wrote that "même une étude objective et 'scientifique' ne devrait pas redouter les réflexions, les conclusions générales appuyées sur des remarques solides."

Jean Boorsch publishes a long and penetrating study of Corneille's tragedies, taking issue with Lanson and discussing the dramatist as one who was seeking, not to portray character, but to arouse emotion in his audience. His work is valuable as counteracting the excesses of the psychological school and as calling attention to Corneille's use of varied means to interest the spectator, to keep him in suspense, and to appeal to his emotions. I do not see, however, that one method is in conflict with the other. Corneille's purpose was to please and pleasure may well result from other methods than those that rouse the emotions. As portraits were popular in the seventeenth century, though not drawn in accordance with the methods of Freud and Proust, a dramatist may well have introduced them into his plays, whether he was at the same time making an emotional appeal or not.¹

Two articles are concerned with Voltaire. In the first E. L.

¹ P. 124, the postponement of Chimène's marriage is said to have been caused by a desire to preserve the unities, but it was rather for the sake of the *bienséances*. P. 126, fourth line from the bottom, for "Horace" read "Curiace." P. 131, B. objects to the amorous intrigue in *Cinna*, and well he may, but it was quite in accord with C.'s desire to make an emotional appeal. P. 133, C.'s defense of Félix is summed up as follows: "ce n'est pas par haine des chrétiens qu'il fait punir son gendre car 'cela nous le rendrait épouvantable,' c'est seulement par une lâche timidité!" B. calls this a "plaidoyer normand" and I suppose it is, but it is one that seems to be approved by certain Pétainistes today when it is applied to the Vichy government. Pp. 143 seq., B. sums up the chief faults of C.'s last ten tragedies as lack of centering, due in part to the introduction of too many characters of importance, absence of inevitability, and substitution of political ambition for *amour-tendresse*. He might have noted that *Suréna* does not show this last characteristic and that the introduction of too many important characters is also seen in *Pompée*.

Edsall points out various similarities in thought between Fontenelle and Voltaire and expresses the opinion that the former exerted considerable influence on the latter. He seems justified so far as fables and oracles are concerned, but their attitudes towards miracles and the age of the world may well have had common sources.² The other article, by P. J. Sturm, traces the history of Joubert's attitude towards Voltaire, whom he at first admired and imitated, but whom he subsequently execrated, though he could never "shut his mind to the charm of Voltaire's art."

Albert Feuillerat, who edits the volume, has contributed to it one of its most important articles, one in which he seeks to discover the principle that guided the arrangement of the poems that make up *les Fleurs du mal*. While his predecessors have studied later editions, F. has turned to the first and has found that the poems in it can be grouped as follows: an *Au lecteur*, *Spleen et Idéal* (poems 1-77), *les Fleurs du mal* (poems 78-89). *Spleen et Idéal* has five subdivisions; *les Fleurs du mal*, four. As B. wished to enlarge the collection and to replace the six poems that had been amputated by the censor, he added in the second edition a number of poems composed in 1858-60. These serve to reenforce the spirit of discouragement and renunciation found in the first collection, but they obscure its vitality by their "nihilisme triomphant." The article shows profound knowledge of Baudelaire and will be welcomed by all who are interested in nineteenth-century poetry.

The volume concludes with a short article on *la Plume*, a journal of 1889-99 which, according to W. K. Cornell, was more pretentious than important.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Word-Hoard. Passages from Old English Literature from the Sixth to the Eleventh Centuries, Translated and Arranged by MARGARET WILLIAMS. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1940. Pp. xvi + 459. \$4.

In the publishers' blurb this book is described as "400 pages of prose and poetry written by the earlier men who wrote English, now rewritten into modern English which preserves all the life and vigor of the originals." And in the author's foreword we are told, "This book is not a history of Old English literature, nor a criticism of it, nor even an exposition of that distant culture. It is an attempt to let Old English literature speak for itself." When however we read the book, we find that these descriptions are inaccurate. The author gives us metrical translations of 17 shorter poems complete (three of these, oddly enough, are left out of her list of "Works

² Cf. D. R. McKee, *Simon Tyssot de Patot and the Seventeenth-Century Background of Critical Deism*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1941.

Translated"), and of 14 of the riddles, together with selections from a number of other works in verse and prose, but all this comes to nothing like 400 pages. In fact the book takes the form of a connected though sketchy history of Old English literature, a history in which the translations and synopses are imbedded. The work falls into 14 chapters, 11 appendices, an epilogue, three bibliographies, nine pages of chronological tables, and an index, besides the introductory matter. It differs from an ordinary history in that the translations make a much larger proportion of the whole than is usual in such works; in short, it is an attempt to combine a history with an anthology, for the benefit of readers who have no Old English.

The book is written with a glow of interest and appreciation for which all professional students of the period will be grateful. It is marred, however, I am sorry to say, by many inaccuracies. Some of the errors may be due to careless or hasty proofreading, but most of them seem to reflect careless or hasty composition. It would be impossible in the space at my command to list all the mistakes in this book, or even a great proportion of them. I must limit myself to a few examples. The contents of OE writings did not run "in streams of oral tradition" only, in ME times, as the author (p. 4) seems to think; the written tradition, though greatly weakened, was never broken, in devotional literature at least. Hearne got his text of *Maldon* (p. 6) from Elphinston, not from the MS itself; this MS, Otho A xii of the Cotton collection, was burned in 1731, but fragments of it still survive in the British Museum. The proper name *Zupitza* is misspelt *Zupitzer* (p. 8). Similarly *Wren* (p. 9) should be *Wrenn*. *Leofric* (p. 12) was an eleventh-century worthy, and therefore could not have made donations in 992. *Leodwisan* means, not "song-wise" (p. 12) but "verse, poetry." Cardinal Guala had a priory of St. Andrew at Chesterton (near Ely), not at Chester (p. 12). The kenning is not properly described as "a Scandinavian form of metaphor" (p. 15 footnote), though its name is of Scandinavian origin. Wherever the runes came from, they were hardly the invention of "tribes of the north-west" (p. 16). If the author had read the section on rime in my edition of *Widsith*, she would not have said that early OE poetry "had no rhyme" (p. 18). It cannot rightly be said of *Widsith* as a whole that "the sentences do not end in the middle of a line" (p. 22), though this can be said of the mnemonic parts or thulas of that poem; see my discussion in *ELH.*, v, 57. The etymology given for *scop* (p. 23 footnote) is hardly tenable. The many mistakes and inconsistencies in the translation of *Widsith* (pp. 24-28), and in the other translations, I will pass over. The author is certainly wrong in calling her translations "as literal as possible" (p. v), if literalness includes accuracy. The book, if revised carefully, might well serve a useful purpose; as it stands, it cannot be commended.

The English Ode from Milton to Keats. By GEORGE N. SHUSTER.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. viii +
314. \$3.00. (Columbia University Studies in English and
Comparative Literature, 150.)

President Shuster's history of the ode has all the outward marks of a learned monograph except a list, at the end, of books consulted. This omission will not gravely inconvenience students, because full references are given throughout in 1036 footnotes. Text and notes alike prove that the author has read or looked into every poet and every source of information he could lay hands on, including several unpublished dissertations or essays. All, indeed, that wide-ranging inquiry and prolonged industry have been able to accomplish is here assembled. The book, nevertheless, is disappointing, and not creditable to American scholarship.

A generous tribute is paid at the outset to this reviewer's doctoral dissertation, *The English Ode to 1660*, written a quarter of a century ago. It is an ungrateful duty to observe that President Shuster would have avoided several mistakes—e. g., in his treatment of Milton, pp. 72, 73—had he made fuller use of it. Bent upon adding an "original contribution" to literary history, he has amassed a great quantity of material which has, for the most part, only a conjectural bearing on his subject—"highly probable," "doubtless," "apparently," "in all likelihood," are the key words on many a page—while he is guilty of hesitation, confusion, or error in his treatment of some questions already settled. It is not a scholar's fault, of course, that the historical study of some literary forms yields meagre results. The ode is one of these forms. And President Shuster, in his effort to produce a big book, independent in approach and dazzling in its erudition, has drawn a blurred picture which half conceals superficiality, shaky learning, and the absence of any important new light. The greater portion of the volume is, like many other so-called literary histories, a mere chronicle, overlaid with critical comment and interpretation. In spots, the interpretation has value. The opening chapter contains a sensible discussion of aims; and passages elsewhere, especially in Chapter II and in the early part of Chapter VI, show penetration and grasp. Many other passages, however, are unimpressive. Cowley, for example, is defended as being "merely baroque to a point bound to exasperate even those who do not dislike the baroque under any and all circumstances" (p. 111). This is a dubious, if not absurd, piece of special pleading, and a numerous company of like instances could be cited if space permitted.

The book is marred, furthermore, by such locutions and forms as the following: "Horace's epistles and sermons" (p. 59); "hardly . . . than" (p. 91); "different . . . than" (pp. 205, 295); "Watts had neither great metaphorical power nor literary ambition,

though he constantly makes one feel that he might have been both" (p. 155); "epigonous" (pp. 146, 152, 179); "programmatic" (pp. 167, 198), "It is after all not a coincidence that Samuel Johnson could make a living translation from the French, writing about Macbeth, and planning a dictionary" (p. 187), "some of this riches has its parallel" (p. 192); "in part because, but not merely only because" (p. 197); "the Augustan Parnassians" (p. 197); "he whiled away many a studious hour" (p. 201); "interpretive reading" (p. 290); "assertions made to the beginning of this book" (p. 295). One of President Shuster's favourite inventions is "dictional" (pp. 202, 211, 244, 247, 276, 286), and this notice may fitly conclude, in his own words, with the statement that his treatise "is quite without dictional distinction" (pp. 168-9).

ROBERT SHAFER

University of Cincinnati

Nineteenth-Century Studies. Collected and edited by HERBERT DAVIS, WILLIAM C. DE VANE, and R. C. BALD. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1940. Pp. ix + 303. \$3.00.

This collection of articles written and edited by members of the Cornell Department of English—two of them "recent members" by the time of publication—is widely representative of the nineteenth century in periods and in types of literary subject-matter. It begins with *The Ancient Mariner* and ends with *The Way of All Flesh*. Four papers on poetry show notable interest in the philosophy of composition. Both R. C. Bald and Harold Wiener write with John Livingston Lowes' theories of the poetic imagination held definitely in mind, and both suggest modification, Bald presenting some "Addenda to *The Road to Xanadu*" in a new study of *The Ancient Mariner*, and Wiener taking Lowes' theory as his point of departure for investigating the sources of Byron's *Turkish Tales*. William De Vane writes on *Browning and the Spirit of Greece*, and Oscar Maurer, Jr. on *William Morris and the Poetry of Escape*, and each author works through to an interestingly paradoxical conclusion.

The fund of biographical material available to students of the romantic poets is enriched by the publication of hitherto unprinted letters by Coleridge, Wordsworth, Southey, Allsop, and Mrs. Gillman—recent additions to the Cornell Wordsworth collection. This material, donated by Mr. Victor Emanuel, has been carefully edited, with detailed annotations, by Leslie N. Broughton. Prose fiction is the subject of studies by Carlisle Moore and Claude Bissell. Some of Moore's findings on the very general topic, *Thomas Carlyle*

and *Fiction: 1822-1834*, would justify a more specific title and more sharply focussed presentation. Bissell's paper on Samuel Butler offers help to readers who wish to get beyond current generalizations on the scientific background of *The Way of All Flesh*. Useful information about the effects of Ruskin's aesthetics on social reform is presented by Frank Curtin in a paper that would gain from condensation but certainly deserves to be included.

In view of the wide interest that has been evoked by Lowes' study of Coleridge it is perhaps justifiable to select Bald's "Coleridge and *The Ancient Mariner*" for such analysis and comment as space allows. Bald has presented excerpts from Coleridge's still unpublished notebooks, not available to Lowes, which, he finds, "elucidate a number of passages in *The Ancient Mariner*, especially those which were altered or added after 1800." They also suggest that Lowes placed too little emphasis, on the one hand, on "the conscious element in the composition of *The Ancient Mariner*," and, on the other, on "the possible influence of opium in furnishing impressions which were incorporated into the poem." Due credit is given to Abrams and others who have been working on Coleridge since the publication of Lowes' book. Bald's first point, the elucidation of passages in the poem, shows sensitive reading of the notebooks and the poem itself, and although the bearing of the one on the other is sometimes remote it is always worth indicating. His discussion of the conscious element in the workings of Coleridge's imagination contains some cogent arguments and some suggestions that are not, as he admits, anything more than suggestions. His third point, on the possible influence of opium, carries conviction. In the face of the evidence presented it is scarcely possible to take exception to the general conclusion, that "the range of mental activity which contributed to the poem was even wider and more complex than has previously been suggested." The paper deserves the close attention of students interested in the psychology of the poetic imagination.

It was highly appropriate that this book should be dedicated to Clark Sutherland Northrup on the occasion of his retirement from the Cornell Department of English, for every one of the studies gives the results of some scholarly research in pertinent fields, and every one says something worth the saying. Occasionally the writing is a trifle heavy for casual readers and at the same time rather diffuse for specialists, who might be glad to have the essential results of the investigations more economically expressed; but, with allowance for the difficulties which editors of occasional volumes inevitably face, it is fair to call this a fitting tribute to an influential scholar and teacher.

ALICE D. SNYDER

Vassar College

BRIEF MENTION

Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600. By IRENE WIEM. Palaestra 219, Leipzig, 1940; 150 pp. For the seventeenth century (Waterhouse), for the eighteenth century (Mary Bell Price), for the period 1895-1934 (Schlosser), bibliographical works of a similar intent were already in existence. A treatment of the sixteenth century was fraught with particular difficulties. Here it did not suffice to ask what English originals were translated into German during these significant years. The question was, what works were accessible to the public of the time that had acquired the habit of reading. Most of the important English works of the age were written in Latin, or if originally written in English, they might be regarded as accessible to the learned in Germany as soon as they were translated into Latin and circulated in Germany. Of 200 works listed, 160 were circulated in Germany in Latin only. Furthermore the exclusion of religious works, doubtfully permissible for the eighteenth century, would have been inexcusable for this earlier period. What works were actually read? The answer was not to be found by the most exhaustive search through even the catalogue of the Preussische Bibliotheken but only in the "Messkataloge" and similar sources.

To one item only in Wiem's introduction will fellow workers take exception. The author tells us that in Max Spirigatis's essay of 1902, *Englische Literatur auf der Frankfurter Messe von 1561-1620*, there are thirty-eight titles for the period before 1600 and adds: "Ich habe mit Rücksicht [darauf] von der Aufnahme dieser Werke in meine Bibliographie abgesehen." Ten pages have been saved, but at what a cost! An otherwise beautiful bibliography is incomplete and successive workers in the field will be either greatly hindered in their work or absolutely thwarted, according to whether or not they can lay hands on Max Spirigatis's compilation.

The text of the bibliography falls into two parts. I. Lateinische Schriften. A. Englische Originalliteratur in lateinischer Sprache. B. Lateinische Übertragungen aus dem Englischen, die von deutschen Übersetzern herrühren (Query: Why not from other translators as well?) and II. Deutsche Übersetzungen. A. aus dem Lateinischen, B. aus dem Englischen. Within these divisions and subdivisions the works are listed in chronological order. The advantage of this is easy to see. The disadvantage is that an identical work may appear under I A. and B. and II A. and B. and the connection can only be recovered through the incomplete cross references or through the apparently excellent index.

In one respect Wiem's bibliography has set a new standard, one which in view of the multiplicity of works in the later centuries,

its successors can scarcely live up to. After every entry there follows any necessary bibliographical note and usually a statement of the occasion of the writing of the book and a general indication of its content. It was no small task to predigest so many heavily titled Latin tomes and it is a service for which later generations of workers will call the author blessed.

LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE

University of California, Berkeley

Dat Dyalogus of twisprake tusschen den wisen coninck Salomon ende Marcolphus. Edited by WILLEM DE VREESE and JAN DE VRIES, "Nederlandsche Volksboeken," VII. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1941. Pp. viii, 75. This fascicle fills the longstanding gap in the admirable series of "Nederlandsche Volksboeken." It makes available a chap-book which had hitherto been available only in the rather unsatisfactory reprint in the extremely rare "Maetschappy der Vlaemsche Bibliophilen" (3d Series, IX; Ghent, 1861. A copy in the University of Chicago Library). Willem de Vreese prepared the text and a bibliographical appendix, but his death halted publication. Jan de Vries has added a second appendix on the source of the Dutch text and the parallels to the jests. The delay has not been harmful, for our knowledge of the cycle of Solomon and Marcolf has been greatly enlarged since De Vreese began his work. The several aspects of this very puzzling cycle can now be readily surveyed. John M. Kemble's old and rare *Salomon and Saturn* (London, 1848), a storehouse of information, has not been completely replaced by Arthur Ritter von Vincenti's *Die altenglischen Dialoge von Salomon und Saturn* (Leipzig, 1904). Such general works are supplemented by editions of the more important texts, e. g., Friedrich Vogt's edition of the MHG romance *Salman und Morolf* (Leipzig, 1889), which is the basis of later studies on the narrative element of the cycle; Walter Benary's fundamental critical text of the Latin dialogue *Salomon et Marcolfus* (Leipzig, 1914); and Walter Hartmann's edition of the late medieval German Spruchgedicht *Salomon und Markolf* (Halle, 1934). We are now promised an American edition of the difficult and puzzling Old English *Salomon and Saturn* to complete the list of editions of important texts. Although our knowledge of the French dialogues or Gregor Haydn's version is not entirely complete or satisfactory, the texts scarcely deserve new editions. Now that we have an introduction to the several branches of this cycle in these several works, e. g., the romantic narrative (Vogt), the jests (De Vries), the dialogue (Kemble, Benary), we can hope that further investigation will illuminate the dark corners.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of California, Berkeley

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

MARCH, 1942

Number 3

GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY

PART VIII

The material used in this article is drawn from the works of Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen, who flourished in the first quarter of the seventeenth century; the abbreviations here employed are explained in Part VII (*MLN.*, LVI, 14).

LADSTECKEN: so ergreift er den Ladtstecken mit außgewendtter Handt, (*Landtrettung* 78); so ergreift er widerumb den Laadtstecken mit außgewendter Handt, (*ib.*); So der Ladtstecken eingesteckt, so bringt er mit der lincken Handt das Rohr wiederumb herfür, (*ib.*).

LANDSPASSAT, LANTPASAT: of this word, not recorded in the *DWb.*, a number of instances, dating from 1661 to 1735, were given in *MLN.*, XLIV, 142. To these can now be added some still earlier examples, which furthermore give an accurate definition of the word: . . . was ein einzige *Compagnia* oder Fändlein von 300. Mann oder Kopffen zu vnderhalten costet. Dann setze durch die Banck dem Hauptman, dem Leuttenant, dem Fanderich, den dreyen *Cherganten* oder Feldweibels, dreyen *Corporals*, dreyen Lantpassaten, achtzehn Gefreiten, Munsterschreiber, Feldscherer, Profoßen &c. Jederem nur Monatlich 10. fl. Wirdt mann finden 3000. fl. (*Landtrettung* 8); Als nemblich, die zu jederen Fahlein gehörig seyndt, Als Hauptman, Leutnant, Fähnrich, Führer, so da *Corporal*, von gefreiten, drey Cherganten oder Feldtwaibel, drey *Corporal*, drey Landtspassaten, darzu so viel Tromschläger . . . (*ib.* 66); Drey Feldtwaybel oder Cherganten vnnd drey Corporael vnd Landtspassaten, die theilen sich also . . . diesem jederen truppen, wird

ein *Corporael* vnd Landtspassat gegeben, so da vber dasselbig Volck, so jhnen vnder hand gegeben vnd vertrauwet wird, *commandiren*, Vnnd hat ein jeder *Corporael* sein besonder Volck, so vnder sein Corporalschafft oder Wacht vnnd befelch gehöret, vnnd ist der Landspassat gleichsam ein Lieutenant deß Corporals. Diese müssen (gleich wie auch alle Befelchshaber, so man sie haben kan) schreiben vnd lesen können. (*ib.* 67); So nun jedem Feldtweibel oder Cherganten, jeden *Corporael* vnd Landspassaten sein vnderhabende Corporalschafft gegeben, so werden die Rotten gemacht, welche ich nun einem jedern frey heym stelle, ob er sie zu 6. oder 8. oder wie er es haben will, starck machen kan, (*ib.*).

The first component of the German word is not *Land*, as Wallhausen assumes, but *Lanze*: it is derived from the French *lancespessade*, which may be cited from sixteenth-century texts:

ledit seigneur Caguin envoya son lieutenant, avecques ses lancepessades, prendre la possession du chasteau ("Mémoires de Messire Martin du Bellay," p. 435, in *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de la France*, Tome cinquième). Du Bellay wrote between 1536 and 1547; je le fis prendre aux capitaines, lieutenans, sergens, corporals lancepessades: ("Commentaires de Messire Blaise de Montluc," in *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires*, Tome septième). The event in question is of the year 1557.

The French word, which later loses its initial letter, goes back to the Italian *lancia spezzata*, "proprement 'lance rompue,' nom qu'on donnait à des cavaliers qui, après avoir rompue leur lance honorablement et perdu leurs chevaux, étaient placés dans l'infanterie avec une situation privilégiée. A servi à désigner dans l'ancienne armée française un aide de caporal" (Bloch, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, I, 32, under *anspessade*). The gist of this definition is given as early as 1727 in Richelet's *Dictionnaire*, II, 523. See also *lance corporal* and *lancepessade* in the *NED*.

LOßDRUCKER: die Musquet muß, wie bey dem Rohr gedacht, hinten woll hoch gehalten werden, vnd daß der Schirmm vom Loßdrucker hart an Leib anzusetzen komme, stehet also in seiner Postur ein wenig mit dem rechten Fuß vor. (*Landtrettung* 79). The word *Drucker* occurs on the same page, and the noun *Loßdrucken* is found on page 80.

LUNTENZEIGER: Item ein klein zinnen Fläschlein mit Baumöhl,

sein Kratzer, Luntenzeiger ahm Bandhier, 13. Puluermassen, daran ein kleines Puluer Flaschlein, (*Landtrettung* 60).

LUSTERLICH: Dann es jhnen nicht allein Lusterlich, sondern auch Heut oder Morgen fur jhr Vatterlandt zustritten nützlich ist. (*Landtrettung* 42). The word is presumably derived from the French *lustre*.

MÄTRESSE: wie viell Obristen, Hauptleuthe, Leutenandt, Fahnrich, vnd andere Officianten, fuhren Theils jhre Eheweiber sampt Kindern, theils Schone Metresse auff Kutschen, auff Wagen, mit, vmb, bey sich? (*Landtrettung* 189).

MITKONSORTE: sondern auch alle seine hinder jhm folgende Mitconsorten, in seiner Reyen, stossen vnd fallen mit jhren Pferden auff jhn: Da dann mancher Kuhrissierer mehr Gefahr seines Lebens, mit Zertrennung seiner nachfolgenden Mitconsorten Pferden sich zu befahren, als er vom Feind hat. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 12^b, 13^a).

MIT SOLDAT: auch in wieder laden sehr Verhinderlich, nicht allein jhm, sondern auch seinen andern Mitsoldaten, so hinder jhm vnd neben seiner Seiten stehen, schädlich ist. (*Landtrettung* 60); Vnd ist also das zweyte Glied seinem Mitsoldatin oder Consorten im ersten Glied oft mehr schädlicher, als der Feind selbst ist: (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 36^b).

MORASSICHT: daß man in Morassichten, Bergichten vnd vngeschickten Orten, mit leichten, mit schweren, mit grossen vnd kleinen Pferden, mit dem einen so wenig als mit dem andern, kan eylendts fortkommen. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 10^a).

PATRON, PATRONTASCH: Nadlen werden vnderschiedene darzu erfordert . . . Die fünffte mit einem Aug, damit man allerley Säcklein oder Patronen machen vnd nähen kan, (*Archiley* 34); Er hat auch in diesem Säcklein etliche Patronen, so auff ein fürfallende Noht zu gebrauchen, oder, so er wil, kan er an statt der Pulverflaschen, auff der rechten Hufft, ein ledern Fuder, oder Patrontasch angegürtet haben, darin er 10. 11. oder mehr Patronen, mit Pulver vnd Kugeln fertig. An der Patrontaschen hat er auch ein klein pulverin. . . . So er ein Patrontaschen hat, vnd sie nicht an der Seiten fuhren wil, hat er sie an dem Sattelknopff vorne fest

gemacht, mit jhren inhabenden Patronen fertig. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 19^b).

PEDARMA: wie der Musquetierer Seitengewehr, ein gute Pedarma, oder schneidendes Schwerdt, auch ein gutten Hawer, wie der Musquetierer am Hals. (*Landtrettung* 75); Sein Seitengewehr neben Stieffel vnd Sporen, ist eine Pedarme, oder ein kurtzscheidende hawend Gewehr, forn mit einer steiffen Spitzen, so beydes zu hawen vnd stechen in zertrenten Squadronen jhm nutzlich vnd dienlich. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 18^b); Sein Seitengewehr ist ein hawend, schneidend Pedarma, damit er sie im fall zum hawen gebrauchet. (*ib.* 19^b).

PETIE: Num. 10. Der Nachtroß, als da sein eines jeden Lantziers sein Jung oder Diener mit einer Petie oder Fuderaische Pferd. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 28^a); Num. 10. Sein der Corazzen jhr Petie oder Fuderaischen Pferde, deren ein jeglicher eines haben muß. (*ib.* 28^b); Auff dieser Compagny Zug, folgen jedere Compagny jhre Nachtroß, als Jungen mit den Petien, oder Fuderaischen Pferden, Rüstwagen, (*ib.* 49^a).

Fuderaische Pferde are *Furage-Pferde*, not as large or as strong as the war-horse of the lancer or cuirassier. *Petie* might therefore be connected with *petit*: in contemporary French sources, however, the word for 'small horse' is *bidet*, which goes over into Dutch. The *Journal van Anthonis Duyck*, 1591-1602, edited by L. Mulder, 1862, has for example: "Noch 51 faenen ruyters, maecken in alles 5324 vechtende peerden, ende noch 987 bidets" (Vol. III, 390, footnote).

PFANNENDECKEL: wie er die Lunthe aufgesetzt, vnd den Haan auff der Pfannendeckel versucht, (*Landtrettung* 77).

PODISMUS: welches ist zwen Schrit in Ghedern vnnd Reyen weit von einander stehen, vnd ist dieser *Podismus* oder Standt der gemeinste vnnd Principaliste, darauß alle andere Standtfassungen, oder Stellungen herrühren, (*Landtrettung* 105).

PORI oder Schweißlöcher: als das Wasser so durch seine *poros* oder Schweißlöcher durch die Erden dringet, suchet so lang, biß es einen Sitz, so da ist ein holer ort findet. (*Archiley* 4); compare *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* VIII, 87, 215, where instances from about 1700 are quoted.

POSTERITÄT: Vnd geschihet an jedenen Ort solches der Posteritet zum ewigen Nutzen- vnd deme so es machen last, zum ewigen Lob (*Landtrettung* 40).

PULVERIN: Vnder dessen er in die Pfannen blaset, so ergreiffet er das Zundtpuluer-Flaschlein oder Puluerin, wie in *n.* 15. vnd thut Zundtpuluer auff die Pfanne, (*Landtrettung* 77); ergreiffet das Puluerin oder Zundt-Puluerflaschlein, lasset die Musquet etwas nieder, thut Zundtpuluer auff die Pfanne, (*ib.* 79).

PUNTE: Diesem folgt, zu weisen, bey der Spitze oder Punte fasse den Spieß: so nimbt man die Spitze deß Spieß in die Lincke Handt (*Landtrettung* 83).

QUIETANRENNEN, QUIETANSTECHEN: Dieweil aber heutiges Tags das Speerbrechen, Ringelrennen, Turniren, vnnnd Quietanstechen, bey vnsern Ritters- vnnnd Adelsleuten gar in Abgang, vnd Vnachtsamkeit gerahten, auch vnter die Banck gesteckt worden, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 2^a); Es ist nur grosser Herrn jhr Kurtzweil vnd Lust, den gebuhrets allein, du hast hiemit nichts zuschaffen, du soltest lang Ringel, Quietanrennen, Turnieren vnd Speerbrechen, &c. ehe du etwas in die Küchen soltest davon bekommen, &c. ansehen. (*ib.* 2^b).

RASIMIR: Ein jedes Geschütz wird abgetheylet in siben Theil, ... Die hinderste Friesen oder Rasimiren, *Num.* 17. (*Archiley* 22).

RAUMNADEL: hernach in das Zündloch mit der Raumnadel hinein raumen vnd besehen, ob dasselbig auch wol offen vnd nicht verstopfft oder vnrein. (*Archiley* 49); So man ausserhalb dieser neuen *invention*, will wissen die Dicke deß Geschütz in der Kammer, so nemme man die Raum nadel mit dem Häcklein, fahre ins Zündloch, vnnnd Ziehe sie im Geschütz an dich, (*ib.* 70). The *DWb.*, without citing an instance of the word, refers to the dictionary of Frisch (1741).

RECREATION: deren Männer ein Büchlein daruon zuschreiben wäre so zu Lust vnd Recreation deß Leibs dienen, 1000. fl. spendiren vnd geben solten, (*Landtrettung* 34).

REGULIST: Die Caliber oder Kugel jeders Geschützes in seiner grösse ist der Regulist, nach welchem das gantze Geschütz wil gereguliret vnd geproportionirt seyn. (*Archiley* 24).

REPERCUSSION: In der Zerreissung der eusseren Lufft, vnnnd in

dem die erste *generirte* Luft in der anderen jhren Platz nimbt, vnd sie zertheilet: Geschihet auch ein *Repercussion* in der eusseren Luft. (*Archiley* 47).

RESERVE, RESERVA: so lasse auff die vorige drey Glieder, nach jhrem abweichen, widerumb andere drey frische, von funffen, so du noch zu einer *reserven* hast, in denselbigen Platz hinein setzen, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 38^b); Num. 3. Seyn die andere Glieder, so auß der *reserve* auff die vorige erste drey abgewichene Glieder treffen. (*ib.* 40^a); habe dieses acht, daß du in aller Eyl, die andere 2. Compagnie, so zur Defension in *reserva*, auch zur Offension sie gebrauchen kanst: (*ib.* 41^b); Die anderen drey werden zur *Reserva* zum letzten behalten, (*ib.* 42^b); vnnnd stelle sie hinten in die *reserve* an beyde Seiten der hindersten Corazzen, (*ib.* 46^a); Diese seynd gleichsam zu einer *reserve* oder Hinderhalt, mit welchen du auffwartest, (*ib.* 47^a); Ein Compagnie Lantzierer, Harquebusirer vnd Kürissirer zur *reserve* oder im Hinderhalt gelassen. (*ib.* 48^b).

RONDASCH, RONDASCHIERER, RONDARTSCHIERER: Hat Gott nicht befohlen Rondasche, Schildt, Spiese, Kriegsgeschutz, (*Archiley* iv^a); Dann was wil ein Bogenschutz zu Fuß ohne Brustharnisch vnd Sturmhaube außrichten, der mit dem Bogen den Schildt, oder die Rondasch nicht halten kan. (*Landtrettung* 25); daß auch diejenige *Legiones*, . . . außershalb der Schilde vnnnd Rondaschen, auch von jhren Harnischen vnnnd Sturmhauben gläntzten, (*ib.*); Es haben auch die Rondaschierer zu Fuß neben ihren Brustharnischen vnd Sturmhauben auch eiserne Stieffeln ahn jhre rechte Schienbeine müssen nemmen. (*ib.*); Vnder den Barbarischen Völkern brauchen die Schildträger, oder Rondaschierer zu Fuß gemeinlich solche, (*ib.* 26); haben sie jhre Rondartschen von geflochtenem weyden Holtz, (*ib.* 150); der mit dem Bogen den Schilt, oder die Rondartsch nicht halten kan? (*ib.* 154); Es haben auch die Rondartschierer zu Fuß, neben jhrem Harnischen (*ib.*); die Barbarischen völker, so mit Schildten zu Fuß, oder Rondartschierer, die brauchten gemeinlichen solche, (*ib.*).

We have here compounds of MHG. *tarsche*, *tartsche*; of especial interest are the passages from *Landtrettung* 25 and 154, which give the same text, first with the spelling 'Rondasch' and the like, and then as 'Rondartsch' and the like.

The *DWb* (VIII, 1516) points out the dependence of the words upon French *rondace*, *rondache*, Italian *rondaccia*, and cites in-

stances of *rondarsch*, *rundtartsch*, *rundarz*, *rondatsch*, and *rundtartschierer*, all dating from the second half of the seventeenth century. *Rondaschierer* and *Rondtartschierer* are not quoted.

RULP: so nemme man alten bedagten Leuten, . . . jhr gewehr, so sie haben, . . . vnd gebe es solchen rulpen auff den Hals, (*Landtrettung* 56).

SALIREN: vnd also die Erde neben jhrer Fettigkeit mit fett machet, vnnd also die Erden saliret oder gesaltzen machet, (*Archiley* 7).

SALVE: vnd deine Musquetirer darzu gewehnen, daß sie allezeit, einer nach dem anderen, gleich schiessen, welches dir auch im *Salve* vnnd anderer Gelgenheit, zu Paß kompt, vnd nicht allein Nutzlich, sonderen auch zierlich ist. (*Landtrettung* 112).

SCHEUNST, SCHEUENST, SCHEUENS: Muß man die Schießlöcher vorn auß nur 4. oder 3. Schuh weit, vnd hinten in der *Batterie* 18. Schuhlang, mit Schantzkörben oder Erden besetzen, Also daß jeder Schantzkorb 7. Schuh hoch vnd weit seyn muß. Werden scheunst also gesetzt, daß man zu forderst gegen das Gesicht deß Feindes, erst 5. darnach 4. dran 3. hierauff 2. vnnd läst 1. Schantzkorb hereinwertz nach der *Batterien* setzen. (*Archiley* 29); Nach diesem sagt man schueuenst[!] traget ewere Spiesse, so lasse den Spieß nur vorn niedersinken, anderhalb schuch hoch von der Erden, als in *num.* 11. hierauff weiset man sie jhre Spiesse auß den beyden Posturen plat vnnd scheuenst tragen, gegen das Fußvolck fallen, oder, wie sie die Spitzen biethen sollen; (*Landtrettung* 82); deßgleichen drey *tempo*, so du den Spieß auff die Schulter legen wilt, es seye Platt oder im scheuenst tragen. (*ib.* 84); Platt trage den Spieß, *Num.* 8. 9. 10. Scheuens trage den Spieß, *Num.* 11. (*ib.* 87); Von hinten zu fälle den Spieß, *num.* 27. 28. 29. Scheuens trage den Spieß, *Num.* 30. 31. 32. (*ib.*); Mercke auch dieses Stücklein, daß du mit jhnen vbest, lasse sie marschiren mit dem Spieß scheuenst, oder wie dir gefällig, lasse sie jhre Spiessen zurück fällen, also daß sie ihre Glieder von hinten schliessen, oder anschliessen, (*ib.* 104). Er richtet oder halt die Pistol dem Pferd, wann er an dem armierten Mann nichts haben mag, in die lincke Brust am Halß: Also daß die Kugel scheunst abwärts hinein nach dem Hertzen deß Pferds gerichtet sey, da er seines Feindes Pferd zu fällen am gewisesten ist: (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 6^b).

The *DWb.*, which cites two further instances in the spelling *scheunst*, likewise from Wallhausen, compares the Low German *schiens* and *schuns*, as well as Dutch *schuins*; Schmeller, who cites MHG. *schiec*, is likewise referred to.

Fischer (*Schwäbisches Wb.* v, 799) cites a weak verb "scheuen" II, concerning which he is completely at a loss:

'einen gefallten Stamm an den Kanten abstumpfen, damit er leichter transportabel ist. *Der Stamm wird gescheut*' o. O. Ganz singular und unkontrollierbar.

Van Dale (*Groot Woordenboek* 1499) defines *schuins* as 'niet onder rechte hoeken,' i. e. 'not right-angled, oblique'; furthermore, he cites the verb *schuinen*, 'schuin maken, snijden,' the counterpart of the verb *scheuen*, cited in the *Schwäbisches Wb.* It may well be that the raftsmen of the Black Forest, when transporting their timber to Holland, there acquired this word which Fischer is unable to explain.

It may also be noted that Diefenbach (*Glossarium latino-germanicum* 387) under the word *obliquus*, cites from a *Voc. rerum primis annis saec. 15*, a form *geschewbt*, which, as it stands, is difficult to explain: if we substitute an *h* for the *b*, we get *geschewht*, which is substantially the verb recorded by Fischer.

SCHOßFREI, SCHUßFREI. Der Lantzierer . . . kan derwegen zweyerley bewehret werden, schwar oder schoßfrey vnd leicht. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 1^b). Als Ringkragen, forder vnnd hinder Leibstück, das Fordertheil oder Bruststück, gegen Mußquet vnnd Pistol Schußfrey, (*ib.* 3^b); Hastu aber einen nicht Schoßfrey armierten oder Blossen für dir, setzestu jhm die Pistol auff die Brust nach dem Hertzen, oder oben auff die Schultern, Kopff, Hals, (*ib.* 7^a); Sein *Armatura* ist diese, ein schoßfrey Waffen in allen Stücken, wie bey der Lantzen erzehlet (*ib.* 18^b). So brauchstu ein schoßfrey Vorderstück, mit einem ledern Riemen Creutzweiß vest angemacht, (*ib.* 19^a); Nvm. 1. Hastu ein blosses Vorderstück so schoßfrey, vnd mit ledern Riemen vmb den Leib fest gegürtet wird. (*ib.* 20^b).

SCHROHE: Lincks, wann du in einer Schrohe hinder deß Pferds Halß, neben dem lincken Ohr an der lincken Seyten sie [d. h. die Lanze] herfür presentirest, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 5^b).

SCHWIELE, SCHWIELBAND: Die Fälgel oder Läufe werden mit

sechs starcken Schieneisen beschlagen, . . . mit starcken Radnaglen angeschlagen, da die Schienen zusammen stossen, mit starcken schwielbanden, vnd jeder mit Schwielen wol versehen. (*Archiley* 26).

SKRUPULOS: vermeynt haben, da je eines oder das ander jhm etwas scrupuloß, soll an seinem Ort besserer bericht erfolgen (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 27^b).

STANDFASSUNG: Die zweyte Standtfassung, geschihet mit doppelter *distantien*, . . . vnnd ist diese Standtfassung vier Schrit weit. (*Landtrettung* 105); Die dritte Standtfassung geschihet, anderhalb doppelt *distantien*, welches sechs Schrit weit seindt, (*ib.*); Die vierdte Standtfassung geschihet, mit zwey doppelt *distantien*, welches ist acht Schrit, (*ib.*); da dann das Schwencken auff zweyerley Weise oder Art vollbracht: Erst mit stehender Standtfassung, darnach mit schweiffender, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 32^b); Rechts schwencken, mit stehender Standtfassung ist, wann der eusserste an der lincken Seiten auff seiner Stelle stehet, vnd die gantze Ordnung sich mit den rechten Fussen, gleichsam herumb zur Lincken hineinwertz herumb begeben, (*ib.*).

STICKADA: Stieffel vnd Sporen, darneben sein Seitengewehr, ein schneidende Stickada oder Wehr, forne mit einer Spitzen zum stechen, auch zum schneiden oder hawen, vnd verwunden bequemlich, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 3^b). The weapon in question seems to be similar to the *Pedarma* described above.

TASCHETTE: ein wol für den Stich vnd Haw, wie auch verflogene kugel Casket, die Beinschiene oder Taschetten, die Knie bedeckent, wol einem jedern nach seiner Läng vnd Grösse gerecht, (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 4^a).

TRANSCIIERUNG: im anschlagen, außkunschaftten, in vnd vor Vestungen, in auffallen, in Transchierungen, bey Tag vnnd Nacht, (*Landtrettung* 55); vnnd wann sie in transchiren, oder blosem Himmel, oder sonsten gewacht, (*ib.* 64); daß ein grosser Platzregen, die von aussen in den transchieren erst vberfallen (*ib.*); sich in Belägerungen in Transchierung, Battereyen Pflantzen, in Gallerien vnnd Minuiren, in die gröste Gefahr begeben, (*ib.* 185); also daß die Kugel jhren ersten Anstoß für der Transchirung oder einwerffung der Wallen jhren ersten Anstoß nemme, so wirdt sie auffgelden, vnnd ins Quartir oder Schantze hinein fliehen. (*Archiley*

59) ; Für einer Festung in den Transchirungen, Apprechen, Lauffgraben, Battereien vnnnd Gallereyen, frey zu seyn, muß man mit stattigem schiessen, alle *defensionen* . . . fleissig benennen. (*ib.* 61). The word is derived from the French *tranchée*, 'trench'; whether the two instances of *transchieren* in the dative plural are to be referred to a nominative *transchier* or to the infinitive *transchieren*, or whether they are misprints for *transchierungen*, is difficult to decide.

TRUMP: Item, Da einer auff Schiltwacht stünde, . . . soll er sein Luntten auff vnd in den Haanen gesetzt, die Pfanne geöffnet, mit zweyen Fingern gedecket, halten, dem vorbey Passierenden den Trump oder das Loch von der Musquet fornen recht nach dem Leib halten: (*Landtrettung* 71). Die Musquetierer vnd Rohrschützen, müssen für allen Dingen darzu gehalten werden, daß sie sich allezeit gewöhnen hinden im zug, vnd vornen, im Lehrnen mit den Handtgrieffen die Musqueten vnd Rohr vorn mit dem Trump wohl in die hohe halten, also daß der Lauff vornen vber eines Manns Kopff hienauß gehe, (*ib.* 81). The normal form of the noun is *Trumm* (compare the plural *Trummer*); Weigand cites, from Abraham a Sancta Clara, the form *Trumb* which he has difficulty in explaining. The mouth of a cannon is designated by the word *Mund*: see below the instances under *Vorschlag*, *Fürschlag*.

VOLTISIREN: Es ist das auff Pferdts springen, so man *voltisiren* heist, nicht allein von den ersten im Außzug geschriebener Man-schafft, sonderen auch von geworbenen vnd alten im Soldt dienenden Soldatten, gar streng vnd ernstlich erfordert vnd gehalten worden, (*Landtrettung* 62).

VORSCHLAG, FÜRSCHLAG: Dieses verricht, wirdt ein Wisch von Hew, Werck oder sonsten gelindt Stroh gemacht, in das Stuck eingeschoben, mit dem Stösser den Wisch, so zuvor fein dicht gemacht wirdt, daß er das verzettete Puluer mit hinein fuhre, an das Puluer angetrieben, so daß Puluers Vorschlag heisset, mit einem Stoß oder zwen sacht ans Puluer hinan. Ziehe heraus den Stösser, ergreiffe die Kugel, wische sie gar sauber ab, daß kein Sandsteinlein oder Körnlein daran hange, lasse sie sacht ins Geschütz, so mit etwas erhabenem Mundt ist, an den Vorschlag hinan lauffen, alsdann widerumb ein Wisch ergriffen, wie der vorige auff die Kugel angedrieben, so der Kuglen Vorschlag heisset. (*Archiley*

51); muß es alles herauß genommen werden, Also, so die Kugel vnd Vorschlag herauß, so richtet man das Stuck mit dem Mundt vorñ in die Hohe, (ib. 76). In the above instances, when applied to a cannon, the word *Vorschlag* designates a wad or wadding; when used in connection with small arms, the word designates some appurtenance of the lock or firing mechanism: Sein Rohr hanget jhm stats am Bandellier am Halß, welches, so ers auff sein Feind loßbrennet, langet ers mit der rechten Hand herfur, ziehet den Haan oder Drachen auff, den Vorschlag ab, mit der lincken Hand, da er den Zaum in hat, fast er das Rohr im Gewicht, legt an vnd scheußt, als Nu. 5. . . . Wie er das Rohr mit der lincken Hand zum Haan auffziehen, vnd den Furschlag abzuthun sich bereydet. (*Kriegs-Kunst zu Pferd* 20^{ab}).

W. KURRELMAYER

"THY GENTILLESSE" IN *WIFE OF BATH'S TALE*,
D 1159-62

To his ungallant remark that she is "comen of so lough a kynde" the Loathly Lady answers her young husband with a disquisition on true nobility. If a man of noble birth does not act in a noble way, we are told,

- He nys nat gentil, be he duc or erl;
 1158 For vileyns synful dedes make a cherl.
 For gentillesse nys but renomee
 1160 Of thyne auncestres, for hire heigh bountee,
 Which is a strange thyng to thy persone.
 1162 Thy gentillesse cometh fro God allone.
 Thanne comth oure verray gentillesse of grace:
 1164 It was no thyng biquethe us with oure place.

Lines 1159-62 are troublesome in several ways.¹ The logical connection is not clear between the general statements in D 1146-58

¹ That the same word *gentillesse* should be used for nobility in the conventional sense in ll. 1159-61 and, in l. 1162, for the distinction conferred upon the individual by his practice of virtue creates no difficulty. Ll. 1109-24 had made the distinction clear enough. Cf. *Roman de la Rose*, 18621-3:

Car gentillece de lignage
 N'est pas gentillece qui vaille
 Pour quei bonté de cueur i faille.

and the apparently personal remarks introduced by the conjunction *for* in D 1159. Are we to understand that the knight himself is being put in the category of those so-called nobles who commit such ignoble actions that they become villains? But such severe judgment on his conduct is hardly compatible with the compliment in D 1162² or with the tone of tolerant amusement in the hag's clearer comments upon her bridegroom's behavior.³ Even disregarding those difficulties, the question comes up why the knight should be brought into the argument at all.⁴ For the point which the woman wants to make is that her humble origin does not exclude her from the ranks of the truly noble. With the knight's nobility, true or false, she should not be more concerned than with his being or not being rich in the next section of her speech, where she demonstrates that poverty is no blemish on her. But is it certain that Chaucer intended D 1159-62 to refer definitely to the knight?

In the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, Book III, Prose 6, we read:

Quae (nobilitas) si ad claritudinem refertur, aliena est. Videtur namque esse nobilitas quaedam de meritis veniens laus parentum. Quod si claritudinem praedicatio facit, illi sint clari necesse est qui praedicantur. Quare splendidum te, si tuam non habes, aliena claritudo non efficit.

Since Philosophy is addressing her devotee Boethius, and he cannot have intended to represent the omniscient goddess as casting doubts upon his personal *claritudo*, the italicized second personal pronoun can only mean the indefinite *any one*. From the Latin it passes into the translations of Jean de Meung,

Pour quoy il s'ensuit que se tu n'as ta propre gentillece, estrange gentillece ne te fait pas gentil,⁵

and of Chaucer:

² One might possibly read this as a guarded praise, understanding "thy gentillesse" to mean "that gentillesse which is your own (whether you have much or little of it)," but this seems far-fetched, and would solve only one of several difficulties.

³ D. 1087-97, 1106-8, 1209-12.

⁴ This and the lack of manuscript support are the only objections to the ingenious emendation suggested by Dr. John S. Kenyon, *MLN.*, LIV (1939), 133-37.

⁵ I wish to thank Professor V. L. Dedek-Héry for sending me a transcription of this passage.

For which thing it folweth that yif thou ne have no gentillesse of thiself (that is to seyn, prys that cometh of thy desert), foreyn gentillesse ne maketh the nat gentil.

As the *Consolation of Philosophy* is clearly one of the main sources of the discussion of nobility in *WBT*⁶ (Boethius is indeed one of the two authorities cited six lines below our D 1162) and as the passage just quoted is by far the closest parallel to D 1159-62 in the *Consolation*, it seems rather likely that the *thou* in our lines is due to the Latin *tu* and was used in the same sense of *any one*. It would not be unlike Chaucer, caught by his genuine interest in the subject⁷ and his pleasure in a learned discussion, to overlook the fact that, in the woman's speech of self-justification, second person pronouns thus used might only too easily be taken to refer expressly to the knight. If this is what happened, the line of thought in D 1146-65 seems to be: A man of noble birth is not *ipso facto* noble, for, if he sins, he becomes a villain (1146-58); for gentility (of the kind which such a person would have) is nothing but fame coming to a man for actions not his own (1159-61), whereas the gentility proper to the individual comes from God alone (1162). True gentility is thus a gift of grace, not of birth (1163-64).

Without claiming that this is, or ever was, a natural way of interpreting the passage on first reading, we should note that, for two reasons, it may well have presented itself to Chaucer's contemporaries more readily than to us. Personal pronouns for the indefinite *some one*, *any one* were used in Middle English far more frequently than at present, and in many more ways.⁸ Indeed, in the hag's discussion of gentility, the numerous *we* and *our* cannot be taken to include the speaker; they mean *people*.⁹ Secondly,

⁶ On other works echoed in this discussion, see pp 19-27 of J. L. Lowes, "Chaucer and Dante's *Convivio*," *MP.*, XIII (1915), 19-33.

⁷ The same interest is shown by many contemporaries; see George McGill Vogt, "Gleanings for the History of a Sentiment: *Generositas virtus, non sanguis*," *JEGP.*, XXIV (1925), 102-23.

⁸ Cf. the use of *thou* in *TC.*, II, 45-46; IV, 1025 ff., 1030-43; for *he* or *she*, see *CT.*, C 544-46, 597-98; *TC.*, III, 34; for a succession of *he's* or *she's* for *one* . . . *another* . . . *another still*, see *TC.*, II, 199, 1747-48; *CT.*, A 2606-19; *LGW.*, 642-48; for shifting from *he* to *they* or to *thou* and *a man*, see *CT.*, I 608-11, 1002-6.

⁹ See D 1163-64 (quoted above), 1117-24, 1130-32.

Chaucer's contemporaries were no doubt more sensitive than we are to the changes from the formal *you* to the informal *thou* in his narratives. Though in conversations between equals the two often alternate without reason,¹⁰ wherever a class distinction exists or nuances of deference and familiarity are of importance, Chaucer's usage seems very nearly consistent, i. e., most of his shifts from one form to the other clearly correspond to changes of attitude in the speakers.¹¹ It would be in keeping with his practice to have the hag use exclusively *thou* when challenging the knight in the presence of the queen, and only *you* in her sober and courteous speech of self defense.¹² And so she does, consistently, if the *thou* of ll.1159-62 is discounted as meaning *any one*. Otherwise the hag's shift to the familiar, half-contemptuous, form in lines which would at least end in a compliment is one more difficulty in the passage.¹³

However, even if many early readers solved the difficulties of D 1159-62 by taking *thou* to mean *any one*, the lines must, from the start, have been felt as at least ambiguous. All that a comparison with the sources can do, in this as in scores of cases, is to suggest a possibility as to the origin of the trouble.

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

Chicago, Illinois

¹⁰ See e. g. *CT.*, A 4040-45, B 2191-94, D 318-19.

¹¹ To give a very few illustrations, in the *Sh T*, the wife always says *you* to her husband, and he always *thou* to her; Don John says *you* to husband and wife, and they to him. No one would say *thou* to the Marquess of Saluces or to January, but they, speaking to Griselde and May, pass from *you* to *thou* according to circumstances. For clearly intentional changes from *you* to *thou* or *vice versa*, see *CT.*, B 3122 ff. (cf. 3114-21, 3978-95), B 4650 (cf. 4000-5, 4637-44), B 4295-99 (cf. 4160, 4310-25, 4348 ff.), D 188 (cf. 169-83).

¹² D 1054-56, 1086. At the first meeting in the forest the hag had greeted the knight with *you* (1002), but shifted to *thou* (except for the unaccountable *you* in 1012) when her assistance was requested and granted. The knight says *you* in this first scene, *thou* when he heaps reproaches upon her, and *you* consistently as soon as she has got the "maistrie." Speaking to the guilty knight, the queen uses only *thou*. Speaking to her, both the knight and the old woman of course use *you*.

¹³ Unless we accept Dr. Kenyon's emendations, by which l. 1162 loses what complimentary character it may have, and the whole passage becomes condemnatory.

"THAT PRECIOUS CORPUS MADRIAN"

Although Chaucer describes Harry Bailly, the merry Host of the Tabard, as being "wys and wel ytaught" (A. 755), with characteristic obliqueness he pokes fun at him by showing that his fluency outruns his knowledge. Though he never lacks for a word to say, the word may be a wrong one or mispronounced. This is particularly true of some of his oaths. "By corpus dominus" (B. 1625) and "By corpus bones" (C. 314) involve obvious errors which would arouse the mirth of the learned. But when he swears "by Seint Ronyan" (C. 310) and "by that precious corpus Madrian" (B. 3082), the humor is more subtle. It has, in fact, often been missed by early scribes and later scholars, who have tried to find out exactly who Saints Ronyan and Madrian were. In the search for Saint Ronyan, Saint Ronan (suggested by Skeat) has given way to Saint Ninian, of whose name Ronyan was a corruption,¹ and the Host is guilty only of a vulgar pronunciation. He seems to be proud of it, however (C. 311), and it appears to amuse the Pardoner, who caps it with another one, "It shal be doon, by Seint Ronyon!" (C. 320) Here it seems to me that Professor Tupper's suggestion of ribald word-play upon "runnion" and "rognon"² is too much in the spirit of Chaucer not to be accepted. Perhaps the jest, being interpreted, is that the Host mispronounces in vulgar fashion the name of St. Ninian, whereupon the delighted Pardoner, from whom ribaldry is to be expected, rings a change upon the Host's pronunciation with such ambiguous implications as Professor Tupper has perceived.

Likewise the other saint invoked by the Host has rather more significance than has been hitherto recognized.³ As no Saint Madrian is known, various saints of whose name Madrian might be

¹ See the notes on l. 310 of the Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale in *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Boston, 1933, p. 833, and in *The Pardoner's Tale*, ed. Carleton Brown, Oxford, 1935 (misdated 1835), p. 26.

² In *JEGP*, xiv (1915), 257, n. 2a, and especially in *JEGP*, xv (1916), 66f, and 106, n. 97.

³ I am unable to see any merit in Mrs. Norris's suggestion (*MLN*, xlviii [1933], 146-148) that "Madrian" was evolved from Harry Bailly's having heard an Italian visitor to London "address the Holy Mother in his own tongue as 'Madre.'"

a corruption have been proposed, Saint Mathurin being deemed the most likely. But earlier commentators appear to have overlooked the fact that there is a common noun, "madrian,"⁴ which is of frequent occurrence in the second half of the fourteenth century in both English and French. Its meaning, however, has never been precisely clear. The *NED.* terms it "a spice,⁵ a kind of ginger"; Godefroy calls it "sorte de fruit"; Canon Fowler, the editor of *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham*,⁶ has the note: "Some sweetmeat. In MS. Harl. 2378 are most elaborate directions at p. 305, 'To make Columbine of madryan,' and at p. 306, 'To make the madryan in counfite,' but their interpretation is not very clear. It seems to have been something like *Sugre in Plate*." When we come to examine pages 305 and 306 of Harl. 2378,⁶ however, the difficulties of interpretation are found to be not so great as Canon Fowler implied, and the true nature of madrian can be ascertained. I transcribe the recipe, "To Mak Conserue of Madrian," having modernized the capitalization and punctuation, and expanded the abbreviations without italics.

Take gynger columbyne⁷ iiij vnces and ley it in faire clene water iiij dayes and ilk a day chaunge it new, þan take dñ lb. of wade askes, a j potell of clere water, and munge all to gedyre and put it in a potte and sette it on þe fyre and mak it to byyle; and whan it hath soden a while put þer-inne with soure hand a gobette of white wollen clowte and draw it oute a-geyne, and if it be rotyn and 3e may pull it a sounder listly, þan it is soden j-now þan sette it don and lat it be clere and put þe clere abouen owte in-to a erthen potte and put þi gynger in-to þe same potte and hull it and sette/ (306) it in hote askes all a nyght þat it may stand warme all nyth in-to þe mornynge. Take a rasyn⁸ in þi hand and a smal pak nedyll and prike it thurgh þe rasyn, and if it go listly thurgh with-owten any krasynge þan it is j-now, and if it be noȝt so late it stand til it be so, and þan take it owte of þat lye and put it in fayre clene water mylke warme, and þus lat it stand ij dayes and ilk a day chawnge it with mylke warme water iiij tymes; and þan take it oute and late it drye be

⁴ Concealed in the *NED.* under the rare spelling "madrean." The usual spelling in both English and French is "madrian."

⁵ *Surtees Soc. Pub.* CIII, 933.

⁶ In photostats obtained through the courtesy of the British Museum. Much of Harl. 2378, although not the pages here referred to, is printed in G. Henslow's *Medical Works of the Fourteenth Century*, London, 1899.

⁷ From Quilon. Cf. W. Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant*, Leipzig, 1923, II, 621. Fowler read this word as part of the heading of the recipe.

⁸ I. e., *racine*. Cf. *Romaunt of the Rose*, l. 4881.

hym-selfe dȝ a day in a wollen cloute wonndyn; and tak dȝ lb of potte suger, j quartorne of a lb. of whyte wyne, and medle þe suger and it to gedyre ouer þe fyre, and streyne it thurgh a streynor, and lat it kele; and put it in a litell erþen potte, and put þi gynger þerto and hyll it and sette it in eymers of hote askes iij dayes and iij nyghtes, and bothen day and nyght kepe it euermore hote, and atte þe iij dayes end take it oute and put þi gynger in a litell panne and þerto j quartorne of fyn sugre raw, and medle all to gedyr on þe fyre til it be-gynne to drye; and þan take it owte of þe panne and hill it warme in a clowte, and þan aftyrward kytte it in smal peces leke a bene.

There follows a recipe "To Mak þe Madrian in Connfite," in which madrian is spoken of as a separate ingredient to be added to sugar syrup, the directions ending "and þis is callid gynger madryan in confyte."

It seems apparent, then, that when ginger was treated with lye the resulting product was called "ginger madrian," or simply "madrian." It is probably not worth while to speculate on all the connotations that the Host's blunder may have called up in the minds of Chaucer's first readers,⁹ but all of them, we can be sure, recognized that when the Host swore "by that precious corpus Madrian" he transformed the vaguely remembered name of some saint into a word familiar to them all as the designation of one of the sweetmeats served when

"The spices and the wyn men forth hem fette."

GEORGE L. FROST

Dartmouth College

Gernemuðe: A PLACE-NAME PUZZLE IN LAWMAN'S *BRUT*

Geoffrey of Monmouth, relating the story of the civil war between the British kings Cadwalan and Edwin, tells how defeated Cadwalan fled to Ireland. From Ireland Cadwalan with his nephew Brian sets sail for Britanny to enlist the aid of King Saloman. Geoffrey goes on to say that on the way to Britanny a storm drove Cadwalan's boat 'in quandam insulam que *Garnareia* [Guernsey] nuncupatur.'¹

⁹ Perhaps those who saw what Professor Tupper did in "Saint Ronyon" were reminded of the use that January made of "spices hote." (E. 1808).

¹ Acton Griscom ed., *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth* (London, 1929), pp. 516-17. *

Wace,² reporting the voyage though without mention of the storm, says that Cadwalan and Brian journeyed

Qu'à Gerneron ³ [Guernsey] sont arrivé,
Une ille vers soloil colcant (ll. 14626-27).

While both Geoffrey and Wace are referring to the island of Guernsey between the peninsulas of the Norman Cotentin and Brittany, Lawman ⁴ puts the matter quite differently;

to ane æt-londe heo bicomæn
bat stondeð bi Gerne-muðe (ll. 30542-43).

Lawman thus tells us that Cadwalan and Brian reach *an island at (or near) the mouth of the Gern(e) river*, which is something quite different from what Geoffrey and Wace say. How then did this discrepancy arise?

Apparently misreading the *-ron*, *-rin*, *-rou*, or *-eui* of Wace (see note 3 above) as *-mue*, Lawman was confronted with a statement palpably incongruous, since an educated Englishman of his day would naturally enough equate a French *Gerne-mue* with ME *Gerne-muðe* ⁵ meaning 'the mouth of a river Gern(e),' not, under any ordinary circumstances, an island. Faced then with the apparent incongruity of Wace's island being designated as a river-mouth, Lawman cut the Gordian knot by placing the *island* (*æt-lond*, NED *ait-land*) *near (bi) the mouth (muðe) of the Gern(e)*.

The final question arises as to whether Lawman in his *Gerne-muðe* had any particular place in mind. In view of his demonstrably inaccurate knowledge of the geography of the south coast of England,⁶ I doubt it, but formally at least two localities are

² Le Roux de Lincy ed., *Le Roman de Brut par Wace* (2 vols., Rouen, 1836), II, 271. Of Ivor Arnold's ed. (Société des anciens textes français, Paris, 1938), only Vol. I (to l. 9004) has as yet been issued.

³ For the Wace variants *Chernerin*, *Gernerou*, and *Gerneu* see Frederick Madden ed., *Lazamon's Brut* (3 vols., London, 1847), III, 425.

⁴ *Ed. cit. supra*.

⁵ See, for example, *-mue* forms of Yarmouth, IoW (OE *mūða*) in Helge Kókeritz, *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight* (Uppsala, 1941), s.v. *Yarmouth*; cited as *PNIoW*. Eilert Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (2d ed., Oxford, 1940), 517; cited as *DEPN*. Ekwall, *English River-Names* (Oxford, 1936), 478; cited as *ERN*.

⁶ See my paper "The English River-Names in Lawman's *Brut*," *Modern Language Notes*, LV (1940), 373-78.

possible; (1) Great Yarmouth (Nf) and (2) Yarmouth in the Isle of Wight. There is no island near Great Yarmouth (Nf) and this place is hopelessly off any route from Ireland to Brittany. On the other hand the IoW Yarmouth is somewhat more feasible since not only is it on the route from Ireland to Brittany, but it is, in a rather special sense, near an island. The western tip of the IoW is known as Freshwater Isle⁷ since this area is almost completely separated from the main body of the island proper on the north by the long wide estuary of the R. Yar, and on the south by the almost contiguous Freshwater Bay, and is thus practically an island in itself. Yarmouth⁸ (IoW) lies across the R. Yar from Freshwater Isle on the northern coast of the island proper; a bridge now connects the town with the Isle.

Lawman's editor, Madden, commenting on this passage (III, 425), accuses the poet of committing a geographical error, saying that Yarmouth is quite off the route from Ireland to Brittany. Though he does not specifically say so, Madden obviously assumed that Lawman's *Gernemuðe* referred to Great Yarmouth⁹ (Nf), but Lawman's statement does not warrant such an assumption.

If one could imagine that Lawman had, after his adaptation of the Wace text, any actual place in mind including in its vicinity an island or an area that is almost an island, one might suppose he had in mind Freshwater Isle (IoW). It would be charitable to credit Lawman with this, and in a translation of the *Brut* where *something* would have to be written, we might render the passage 'to an island (Freshwater Isle) near Yarmouth IoW.'

In conclusion it may be noted that for the purposes of the narrative either Guernsey (Geoffrey's *Garnareia* and Wace's *Gerneron*) or Freshwater Isle (Lawman's *ætlonde bi Gernemuðe*) are equally acceptable localities for Cadwalan and Brian to stop at between Ireland and Brittany.

ROLAND BLENNER-HASSETT

Cambridge, Mass.

⁷ *PNIoW*, s. v. *Freshwater*. William Page ed, *A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (The Victoria History of the Counties of England, London, 1912), v, 240 ff.; cited as *Page*.

⁸ *Page*, v, 286 ff. See also G. B. Grundy, "The Saxon Land Charters of Hampshire with notes on Place and Field Names," *The Archaeological Journal* (2d ser.) xxxiv (1927), 321.

⁹ *DEPN*, 517.

ALYOSHA VALKOVSKY AND PRINCE MYSHKIN

Much has been written about Dostoyevsky in the past years but there are still certain aspects of his novels which have not been explored. Thus for example E. J. Simmons in his last book (*Dostoevski, the Making of a Novelist*, Oxford University Press, 1940) studies the methods by which the author developed his characters from his notebooks but he has little to say about the repeated treatment in various forms of substantially one and the same situation.

In all this the *Insulted and Injured* has been one of the most neglected novels but despite that fact it marks as it were a turning point in the career of Dostoyevsky. Exactly as in this novel he returns and criticizes his own first novel *Poor Folk*, so he advances certain ideas and situations to which he returns later, especially in the *Idiot*, which is of course a far greater and more important production.

Simmons in his book (p. 230) notes that the relations of Aglaya and her mother are similar to those of Natasha Ikhmeneva and her father in the earlier work. This is true but there is a more important comparison possible and this well illustrates the way in which Dostoyevsky deepened and magnified episodes and ideas in his earlier works, as he grew in vigor and in energy. This is the similarity of the interview of the four characters, Natasha, Katya, Alyosha and Ivan Petrovich in the first work and of Nastasya Filipovna, Aglaya, the Idiot and Rogozhin in the second.

At first sight there may seem little in common between the insignificant Alyosha with all of his sensual weakness and the outstanding figure of the *Idiot*. Yet there are closer parallels than we might think. These have been veiled by the tendency to consider the *Insulted and Injured* from the standpoint of Ivan Petrovich, the narrator. The sympathy of the reader is won by his willingness to sacrifice himself for Natasha and to serve her at the cost of his own happiness. For this reason the almost despicable actions of Alyosha are not considered to the fullest extent.

Yet we can look further with justice. It is a commonplace that every one considers Myshkin an idiot. They tell him so to his face and behind his back. No one has any respect for Alyosha. His

cynical old father says very frankly, "although my Aleksyey is a fool" (*op. cit.*, ed. Ladyzhnikov, p. 323). Ivan Petrovich on first meeting Katya understood why Alyosha fell in love with her, for Katya was able to dominate him thoroughly. As for the boy, "his heart was noble and not to be overcome and submitted at once to everything that was honorable and beautiful" (*op. cit.*, p. 311).

Alyosha is constantly trying to maintain a ridiculous position in which he believes. He pays no attention to the logic of his statements. He explains to Natasha his attitude in a very revealing phrase:

He swore his constant, unchanging love for her and with fervor he justified his attachment to Katya; he constantly kept repeating that he loved Katya only as a sister, as a dear, good sister, whom he could never absolutely leave; that it would even be rude and cruel on his part and he kept assuring her, that if Natasha knew Katya, they would both become friends, so that they would never separate, and then there would be no misunderstanding (*op. cit.*, p. 261).

It is to be noted that in this Alyosha takes the same attitude to Katya as Myshkin does to Aglaya, to whom he writes as to a sister. Even after the stormy scene, Myshkin is perfectly able to tell Evgeny Pavlovich that he still loves the two women and that he is sure that Aglaya will understand the situation and the reason why he remained with Nastasya, and explains further that Aglaya is a child, absolutely a child (*Idiot*, II, 362 ff.). Likewise Ivan Petrovich decides that Katya is really a child. "She was a complete child, but a strange, convinced child, with firm rules and with a passionate, hostile love for the good and justice" (*op. cit.*, 310 f.), and he adds doubts as to her actual knowledge of the relations between men and women.

Katya is a young, innocent and respectable girl. Natasha has been seduced. So likewise Aglaya is a cornerstone of respectable society and Nastasya Filippovna has known sad experiences. Both Natasha and Nastasya are the daughters of small proprietors who have been ruined by some one of the families that wrecked their fathers' careers.

So too with the meeting of the four. Alyosha escorts Katya into Natasha's quarters, exactly as Myshkin brings Aglaya to Nastasya's. At the end of the interview Alyosha remains for a while with Natasha, just as Myshkin remains with Nastasya. There is the difference that Ivan Petrovich who is perhaps less similar to

Rogozhin than are any of the others of the two sets will come back later, when Alyosha is leaving to rejoin Katya.

The difference in these scenes which form the crisis of the two novels is to be found in the tempo of the scene and in the spirit of the woman. In the *Insulted and Injured* both women who are in love with Alyosha try to spare his feelings. They even try to keep him out of the room while they are discussing which one is to give him up and both, although they are fully conscious that they will not meet again, try to keep from humiliating the weak Alyosha. In the *Idiot*, the situation is different. The two women with all their similarities of character are diabolically proud. They are mortal enemies and in their desire to humiliate each other, they do not spare the feelings of Prince Myshkin who would give anything not to have the situation come to a final break. The scene in the *Idiot* is pitched to the most vehement melodrama and in it Dostoyevsky uses all of his undoubted power for moving the reader and for working him up to a tense anxiety.

A detailed analysis of the Natasha-Alyosha-Katya triangle will show the similarity to the Nastasya-Myshkin-Aglaya plot, but there is of course no comparison in the two novels. The *Insulted and Injured* is "closely connected in style and tone with the French romantic novel of social compassion and with the later and less humorous novels of Dickens. The religion of compassion, verging often on melodramatic sentimentality, finds there its purest expression, as yet uncomplicated by the deeper problems of the next period" (Mirsky, *History of Russian Literature*, p. 346). The *Idiot* is one of the novels in which the cursed questions of the human heart are analyzed and the relations of God and man, of the spirit and the flesh, of Russia and Europe are all brought in on a grand scale.

Both Alyosha and Myshkin are types of the weak heart, characters who are dominated by the passing emotion of the moment. Both are irresponsible but in Myshkin irresponsibility has been raised to the height of genius. Alyosha, despite the comments of his rival Ivan Petrovich, is nothing but a weak and spineless sensualist. Myshkin may have traits that are almost Christlike in the influence that he is able to exert upon all whom he meets.

Nevertheless the relations between the two men and the women who surround them are strikingly similar. Dostoyevsky in his

greater novels uses again and again in the same way phrases, ideas and situations which he has used before but each time he deepens them, renders them more tense and steps up the tempo of the movement, until he finally produces out of commonplace material unforgettable scenes of rare power and psychological depth.

So it is in the relation of these two novels. At first sight it seems that little comparison is possible but an analysis of the situation and of the status of the characters reveals the similarity. Before we can understand the whole question of the artistic growth of Dostoyevsky, we must study as in this case his use and re-use of the same materials under different forms and only then can we appreciate the full art which he has applied in his descriptions of the heights and depths of human nature and of the forces of good and evil in the world.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

SLANDEROUS COMEDIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ORLEANS IN 1447

Among the records of the medieval university of Orléans, there is a document containing a reference to slanderous theatrical performances considerably earlier in date than those known to Petit de Julleville and Creizenach. Both these authors quote the Statutes of the Collège de Navarre in Paris, which in 1315 forbade unseemly performances at the fêtes of St. Nicholas and St. Catherine,¹ but they question whether these *ludi* were comedies. They also refer to two texts,² dated 1426 and (erroneously) 1431,³ which were played by students, but which do not appear to have been of a

¹ L. Petit de Julleville, *Les comédiens en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1885), p. 296; W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, I (Halle, 1911), 437. The quotation is from DuBoulay, *Historia universitatis parisiensis* (Paris, 1665-73), IV, 93. It reads: *nullum ludum inhonestum faciant*.

² Petit de Julleville, *Comédiens . . .*, p. 296; Creizenach, pp. 437-8. The first of these is the earliest morality play known to us, and was "faite au collège de Navarre le jour de Saint-Antoine, 1426." This play, thought lost by Petit de Julleville (*Répertoire . . .*, p. 307), was discovered by Morawski (*Rev. des langues romanes*, LXV [1927], pp. 71 ff.). The second,

slandrous nature. The first prohibitions hitherto cited of slanderous comedies in the universities are one of the year 1462, when the university of Paris forbade those attacking princes and lords, and one of 1483 prohibiting attacks on 'honorable persons.'⁴ The Orléans document is dated 1447. In that year Charles VII found it necessary to announce a *Reformation* of the university of Orléans and issued a new set of rules and regulations for its administration and discipline. This contained royal comments on student rowdiness in taverns, games of dice in which "they consume their parents' goods and are vilely distracted from their books,"⁵ and behavior in university meetings where they caused "scandalous agitation with their voices, feet and hands."⁶

The passage concerning comedies refers to performances given by the various Nations at the university of Orléans, supposedly on the occasion of their festivals,⁷ but apparently extending illegally into

a "diagolus," also found by Morawski, he dates merely "antérieur à l'année 1433."

⁴ Petit de Julleville, *Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1886), 299, 307, 328.

⁵ Petit de Julleville, *Comédiens* . . . , pp 296-7; Creizenach, p. 438; DuBoulay, v, 761.

⁶ Quia nonnulli scolares, in frequentione tabernarum et ludis taxillorum et alearum, bona parentum consummant etiam usque ad vilem distractionem librorum. (M. Fournier, *Les statuts et privilèges des universités françaises* . . . I [Paris, 1891], 221)

⁷ Cum in congregationibus Universitatis predictae et Nationum, necnon in collegiis plerisque, hodie, indiscretis vocibus, pedumque ac manuum scandalosis agitationibus perstreptantes et, quod deterius est, obstinatis disceptationibus, clamores tumultuosos et risus et gestus contumeliosos effundentes deliberationem impediunt ceterorum . . . (Fournier, I, 216.)

⁸ Celebrated on the anniversary of the patron saint of the Nation. Each *Liber nationis* contained a calendar for the year, which have been published in composite form by Fournier, I, 17-20. It appears from these that the feast days of the Nations were as follows: Germany, Feast of the Three Kings (Epiphany), January 6, France, St. Guillaume, January 10; Picardy, St. Firmin, January 13; Burgundy, St. Anthony, January 17; Touraine, St. Julian, January 27; Aquitaine, St. Blaise, February 3; Lorraine, St. Nicholas, November 6; Normandy, Conception of the Virgin, November 8; Champagne, St. Nicaise, November 14; Scotland, Passion of St. Andrew, November 30. In addition some Nations celebrated extra days, either because of several patron saints, or because of several anniversaries connected with the same saint.

There seems to be no explanation of the curious concentration of festivals in January and November.

other periods and interfering with the work of the university. The comedies were objected to because of the time and expense involved and because they contained attacks on other Nations and individual members thereof, often resulting in serious quarrels. The passage, inaccurately transcribed by Fournier,⁸ is to be found in all extant copies of the Reform Statutes which we have been able to examine.⁹ It reads as follows:

quoniam¹⁰ in festivitibus¹¹ nationum, plurimi committuntur abusus et expense fiunt inutiles ex quibus et nationes in communi et supposita particularia pregravantur contentiones ()¹² iurgia ex detractoris comediis oriuntur scolares a suo studio per magna tempore¹³ distrahantur¹⁴ non contenti talia quandoque in dictis festivitibus exercere sed et una natio aliam superet¹⁵ aliis temporibus dilatare prohibetur quod de cetero non fiunt comedie etiam sub forma moralitatum detractio¹⁶ nationis vel alicujus particularis contrarium facientibus¹⁷ taliter et per universitatem et per prepositum puniendis quod cedat ceteris in exemplum In aliis autem honestas et moderatio in dictis festivitibus observetur quod talia scandala expense et distractiones de cetero non auriuntur.¹⁸

⁸ *Statuts*, I, 218

⁹ *Liber Nationis Francie*, Herzogliche Bibliothek, Wolfenbützel, MS 78.8 Aug, fo. 72r; *Liber Nationis Francie*, Archives du Loiret, MS D 6, fo. 71r; *Liber Nationis Turonie*, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS L 4354D, fo. 71-72r.

We have microfilm or photostats of the above MSS. Because of the present inaccessibility of the collection, it has been impossible to examine the only other extant copy of the Statutes of Charles VII, Archives du Loiret, MS D 3, fo. 46r ff, the *Liber Rectorum* of the university. Other surviving books are incomplete and do not contain these statutes, such as the book of the German Nation, Archives du Loiret, MS D 4, that of the Nation of Champagne, Archives du Loiret, MS D 5, and that of Scotland, Vatican Library, MS Regina Latina 405. The photostats and microfilm used were provided by grants-in-aid (American Council of Learned Societies and Duke University Research Council) to Dorothy M. Quynn for a study of the university of Orléans. She wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to both councils

¹⁰ *qui* in Wolfenbützel MS.

¹¹ *festantibus* in Wolfenbützel MS.

¹² *et* in Wolfenbützel and Bib. Nat. MSS.

¹³ *tempora* in Wolfenbützel and Bib. Nat. MSS.

¹⁴ *distrahuntur* in Wolfenbützel and Bib. Nat. MSS.

¹⁵ Our photostat of the *Liber Nationis Turonie* ends with this word.

¹⁶ *detractoris* in Wolfenbützel MS.

¹⁷ Omitted in Wolfenbützel MS.

¹⁸ *oriantur* in Wolfenbützel MS.

This prohibition applied to all ten of the Nations of the university, the Statutes of which it was a part having been duly registered in the Parlement of Paris, July 31, 1447.¹⁹

DOROTHY MACKAY QUINN
HAROLD SINCLAIR SNELLGROVE

Duke University

LUDOS SCENICOS IN GIRALDUS

One of the problems which interests most the students of medieval drama is the situation around 1200 which preceded our earliest extant specimens of Old French comedy, the tavern scenes in the *Jeu de Saint-Nicolas*, the *Courtois d'Arras*, and so on. In this connection, there is a story narrated twice by Giraldus Cambrensis, evidently a favorite of his, in almost the same language. On his return from France in 1179, this episode occurred:

Moving on, when he [Giraldus] had crossed from Flanders, he reached Canterbury on Trinity Sunday, and dined with the monks of that place in the refectory, on the invitation of the prior. Where, as he himself has often told, sitting with the prior and the senior monks at the head table, he noted two things: the excessive use of signs and the large number of dishes on the table. For the prior kept making gestures to the monks serving, to him [Giraldus], and down to the lower tables, and those to whom the dishes were brought kept giving expressions of thanks, by gesticulation of the fingers, hands, and arms, and by hissing or whistling (*sibilis*), instead of with words, expressing themselves far more easily and freely than was fitting, almost as seemed to him [Giraldus] to be done *ad ludos scenicos aut inter histriones et joculariores*.¹

What of these *ludos scenicos* which are here mentioned apart from the mimicry of mere minstrels and public entertainers? Did

¹⁹ Archives du Loiret, MS D 7, fo. 74r.

¹ *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, II, 5 (ed. J. S. Brewer, Rolls Series, no. 21, vol. 1, London, 1861, p. 51); *Speculum Ecclesie*, II, 4 (*ibid.*, vol. 4, pp. 40-1).

It is not clear to me why W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neuen Dramas*, vol. I, Edmond Faral, *Les jongleurs en France au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1910), E. K. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), Karl Young, *The Drama of the Mediaeval Church* (Oxford, 1933), and Gustave Cohen, *Le théâtre en France au moyen-âge*, vol. II (Paris, 1931) have not given at least passing mention to this passage from Giraldus.

Giraldus first make his comparison with the *ludos* in 1179, or in 1206 when he first tells the story? All evidence points to the fact that a *ludus scenicus*, or *ludus theatralis* was a performed play and was not just a simple narrative or recitation by a single minstrel.² My purpose here is merely to call attention to this passage which has been neglected by historians of the drama. It is possible to interpret it in various ways. Personally I believe that the reference to unseemly gestures in *ludos scenicos* was made at the time (1179) and therefore it precedes the *Jeu de Saint-Nicolas* of Jehan Bodel which was performed probably at the very close of the century, before 1202. Were the *Jeu d'Adam* and other religious plays, in Latin and the vernacular, performed with unseemly gestures and hissings? If they were, then Giraldus may well be referring to them. I wish to suggest, however, that Giraldus had in mind presentations of comic *ludos scenicos*, of some type, which existed in the last quarter of the Twelfth century.

In this connection we should like to call the reader's attention to two other passages in Giraldus, also neglected, in which he gives some indication of the setting for performances of *choreas* or *caroles*. He speaks of as many as two hundred girls and men taking part, while the audience sat around them.³ A pilgrim knight sat next to a charming lady on one of these occasions and she pointed out a nearby monk who had also come "ad choream videndum et cantilenas audendum."⁴ This took place "in ulterioris provinciae vico," meaning Provence; the other scene took place just south of Paris. These scenes, sketched in a few lines by Giraldus, give some idea of the heterogeneous audience that attended the dance festivals together, and perhaps also they may be applied to the *ludos scenicos*.

URBAN T. HOLMES, JR.

The University of North Carolina

² The word *scenicus* is not treated for the Middle Ages by either DuCange or Baxter and Johnson, *Mediaeval Latin Word-List* (Oxford, 1934). A medieval gloss published by Mario Roques, *Recueil des lexicques fr̄s au moyen-âge*, II, 387, gives *teatralis* for *scenicus*.

³ *Speculum Ecclesie*, cit. supra, II, 5, p. 43.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 6, pp. 44-5. "in eodem consessu . . ." is the expression which describes the position of the monk.

POUR L'HISTOIRE DU ROMAN ROYAL

Dans l'*Histoire des Amours du Grand Alcandre*, Louise-Marguerite de Lorraine, Princesse de Conti, avait entremêlé des souvenirs de ses premières aventures galantes, assez pittoresques au dire de Tallemant des Réaux, au récit des amours du Vert Galant et de la belle Gabrielle d'Estrées. La première édition de ces mémoires parut en 1660, près de trente ans après la mort de leur auteur. Mais l'ouvrage circulait depuis longtemps en manuscrit et deux romans qui racontaient, sous des noms déguisés, les mêmes aventures et les mêmes intrigues amoureuses, avaient paru du vivant même de la Princesse. C'étaient *Les Advantures de la Cour de Perse*, parues en 1629 sous le nom de Jean Baudoun, publiciste et traducteur connu, plus tard membre de l'Académie de Richelieu, et le *Roman Royal, ou histoures de nostre temps, ausquelles sous noms feints et empruntez sont representez les divers effects de l'Amour*, publié dès 1621 sous le nom à peine connu de Nicolas Piloust.

Dans une étude sur *Les Romans de la Princesse de Conti*,¹ nous avons essayé d'éclaircir les rapports existant entre ces trois ouvrages. Leur analyse suffit pour prouver qu'ils ne font que répéter la même matière, parfois même sous une forme à peu près identique; on ne peut cependant rien déduire sur les circonstances auxquelles nous devons ces trois formes différentes du même récit. Sur ce point, on ne pouvait faire que des hypothèses; un nouveau témoignage vient heureusement éclairer l'histoire de la plus ancienne des trois versions, le *Roman Royal* de Piloust.

On connaît, dans l'*Histoire Comique de Francion*, les épisodes dans lesquelles on s'amuse aux dépens du pédant Hortensius. Parmi les discours de ce personnage, qui sont tous des modèles d'une éloquence aussi creuse que ridicule, un seul semble à la compagnie qui les écoute "meilleur que pas un autre qu'il eût fait," et c'est le discours qu'il fait en réponse à la question de Francion, sur les meilleurs écrivains de l'époque.

Il s'étend longuement sur ce type d'écrivain compilateur, qui "a pris des anciens livres où il a changé trois ou quatre lignes au commencement et les a fait imprimer sous de nouveaux titres, afin d'abuser ainsi le peuple." Ce type d'écrivain était assez commun

¹ Dans *Mélanges de l'Ecole Roumaine en France*, XII (1935-1936), pp. 3-55.

à l'époque, et Balzac lui-même l'avait démasqué avec une juste sévérité. Pour ces plagiaires, Hortensius proposerait un supplice nouveau : il voudrait les voir condamner à boire en Place de Grève autant d'encre qu'ils en ont fait répandre inutilement. "Il y en a bien d'autres," ajoute-t-il, "dignes de même punition ; mais ils diront chacun, pour leur défense, comme celui à qui l'on vouloit donner des coups de bâton, pour avoir dérobé le roman d'une de nos princesses et l'avoir fait imprimer : Hélas ! pardonnez-moi ; ce que j'en ai fait n'a été que pour tâcher d'avoir du pain ; je n'ai pas cru faire mal." ²

Cette princesse aux préoccupations littéraires, et dont un ouvrage a ainsi été imprimé, ne saurait être autre que la Princesse de Conti. Nous voyons dans Nicolas Piloust le misérable écrivain qui, pour remédier à la détresse matérielle où le maintenait son peu de talent, avait trouvé plus profitable de se parer des plumes d'un autre et de publier sous son nom le roman de notre Princesse. Qu'il n'ait pas été lui-même l'auteur du *Roman Royal*, et qu'il n'ait fait que publier un texte qui courait déjà en manuscrit, c'est ce qui résulte assez clairement des aveux qu'il fait dans la préface : "Bien que plusieurs esprits, plus sensez et mieux fondez que le mien, n'ayent voulu entreprendre de composer ce Roman Royal, si me l'estant commandé par une personne signalée sur toutes autres par ses mérites et vertus, j'ay osé le dresser et te l'offrir en l'estat que tu le vois."

"Composer" le *Roman Royal*, c'était le préparer pour l'impression et se donner ce minimum de peine qu'imposaient les quelques modifications insignifiantes du style et le changement d'identité des personnages. C'est à quoi se limite l'intervention de Piloust. Mais ce que l'on ne savait pas, c'est que cet écrivain ait accompli sa besogne sans l'autorisation de la Princesse de Conti. Il espérait en tirer un profit qu'il n'aurait su obtenir par ses propres moyens, mais il faillit être payé en coups de bâton, comme c'était plus ou moins l'usage à l'époque. C'est du moins ce qui semble résulter de l'allusion de Hortensius. Cette fois au moins, il faut faire crédit à ce vieux pédant, car Charles Sorel le fait parler à sa place, afin de faire, une fois de plus, la satire des mœurs littéraires de son temps.

ALEXANDRE CIORĂNESCU

Bucarest

² Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*, éd. Emile Roy, iv, 17. Pour Roy cette princesse est "peut-être . . . la Princesse de Conti"

TWO NEW MANUSCRIPT VERSIONS OF
MILTON'S HOBSON POEMS

In an article in the *Modern Language Review*,¹ Professor W. R. Parker discusses the textual history of Milton's two Hobson poems and points out the existence of a single manuscript version of the "second" poem² in the Bodleian Library (MS. Mal. 21, fol. 69). He states further that he was unable to trace any manuscript copy of the "first" Hobson verses. It was my fortune lately, while grubbing in seventeenth-century commonplace books, to light upon not only another draft of the "second" poem, but a draft of the "first" Hobson verses as well.

The manuscript of the "first" poem is preserved in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C., in a commonplace book (MS. 1.21, fols. 79-80').³ The handwriting and other contents of the volume seem to indicate a date somewhere about 1640-50, perhaps a little earlier. The title of Milton's verses runs:

On Hobson who dyed in the
vacany [*sic*] of his Carrage by
reason of the Sicknes att
Cambridge. 1630.

The transcript contains only three variants, ignoring punctuation and spelling, from the 1673 text, two of which also differ from the readings of the texts of 1645 and 1658:

Line 7 this] those *MS*

8 betwixt] twixt *MS* (1658)

14 In the kind office of] In craftie likenes of *MS*

The last reading is the most interesting and, I think, considerably superior in point of force and imagery to the accepted text.

The new manuscript of the "second" Hobson poem, also in a pre-Restoration commonplace book (MS. H. M. 116, pp. 100-

¹ *MLR* (July, 1936), 395-402.

² In designating the Hobson poems "first" and "second" I adhere to the order of the 1645 and 1673 editions of Milton's *Poems*. Professor Parker, from certain bibliographical considerations, discusses them in the reverse order.

³ I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of the Curator, Dr. J. Q. Adams, and the Trustees of the Folger Shakespeare Library in permitting me to make use of this manuscript.

101), is now in the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California.⁴ Textually this version, which reduces the thirty-four lines of the 1673 text to twenty-six, is closely connected with the Bodleian MS. and the printed versions of 1640 and 1658.⁵ The poem is entitled:

Vpon old Hobson Cambridge Carrier who
dyed 1630 in y^e Vacation by reason
of y^e Sicknesse yⁿ hot at Camb.

In the following list I have included all the verbal variants and a few differences in punctuation which appear to have some bearing on the reading of the text. The printed text here collated is again the 1673 edition of the *Poems*.

- Line* 1 Here lieth one who] Here Hobson lyes, who *MS*
2 die while he could] dye, whilst he did *MS*
4 While he] So he *MS*
5 sphear-metal,] spheare Mettal *MS*
6 revolution] resolution *MS*
7-8 motion, yet (without . . . truth)] motion (yet without
a crime)/ 'Gainst old truths *MS*
8 number'd] numbred *MS*
9 an Engin] some engine *MS*
11 Rest that] Rest, y^t *MS*
gave] giu's *MS*
13 Nor] No *MS*
14 hastned] hastend *MS*
15-20 Meerly to drive . . . make six bearers.] *Omitted in MS.*
21 his chief disease] his disease *MS*
and to judge right] and (to rudge aright *MS*
22 went] was *MS*
25-26 That even . . . more waight;] *Omitted in MS.*
27 But had his doings] For had his doing *MS*
28 been an] bene so sure an *MS*
30 and had his] & his *MS*
32 (strange to think)] stronge to thinke *MS*
33 deliver'd all and gon] deliuer'd, all are gone *MS*⁶

⁴ The Trustees of the Huntington Library have most kindly allowed me to make use of this manuscript.

⁵ Professor Parker deals at some length with the relationship of these texts (*op. cit.*, 398-400).

⁶ The readings of the other texts may be consulted either in Professor Parker's article (*op. cit.*, 397-98) or in the new *Columbia Milton*, Vol. I, Part ii (ed. F. A. Patterson), 1931, p. 431, and Vol. xviii (ed. T. O. Mabbott and J. M. French), 1938, p. 585.

The manuscript reading in line 33 seems a decided improvement over the reading of all the other texts.

The supporting evidence of this new manuscript seems strongly to corroborate Professor Parker's suggestion that there were at least two distinct Miltonic versions of the "second" Hobson poem. As he writes:

It is just possible, of course, that the people who wrote *A Banquet of Jestes* [1640], *Wit Restor'd* [1658], and the Malone MS found the passage [the omitted lines] cumbrous or ambiguous, and therefore deleted it. But such a theory puts a great strain upon coincidence, and it is almost incredible that all three should have altered 'But' (in line 27) [see the collation above] to 'For' in order to mark the transition.⁷

To deny that a fourth independent example almost settles the case is, it seems to me, to pull the long arm of coincidence quite out of joint.

G. BLAKEMORE EVANS

University of Wisconsin

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER FROM ABRAHAM COWLEY

A further letter from Cowley, dating from the same period as those published in *MLN*, LIV, 455-7, is in the Bodleian Library (MS. Carte 130, fol. 169). It too appears to have been addressed to Sir Robert Long, then Secretary of State to Charles II, for it is bound in with a collection of letters received by him and is endorsed in his hand: "Mr. Cooley." The text of the letter is as follows:

Paris. March 13. 1650:

Sir,

I sent you not the french Translation of the Letter to my Lord Montrose¹ till now, in hope to get one in Latin too, but cannot find any in the Town,

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 402. Professor Parker develops his argument on pp. 398-400.

¹ This is apparently the letter from Charles II to Montrose written from Jersey on 22 January 1650 (N. S.) and printed in Carte's *Collection of Original Letters and Papers*, I, 356-8; see Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (ed. 1894), I, 213-4. I have been unable to find any copies of the French and Latin translations which Cowley refers to; but in the same volume of the Carte MSS. (fol. 154) there are printed copies of Montrose's *Declaration* to the Scots in French and Latin,

nor learn y^t any such has bin printed here. Mr Messenger has bin again wth the Printer, but finds him now more cautious then before, soe y^t hee is not able to give you any more information, then y^t of his last Letter. Noe doubt it has donne the King a great deal of hurt, but it is very happy y^t it has mist of the cheife end for w^{ch} I conceive it was published, w^{ch} was to hinder the Treaty,² That danger is now over, and y^e onely doubt remaining is whether the Treaty will produce an agreement,³ and I dare say all the world besides a few of our nation, beleive it soe great a madnes not to agree, y^t they think it impossible to happen, but of this you are a better iudge then I, as of all other truths besides this one y^t I am,

St,

Y^r most humble and
most obedient Servant

A COWLEY.

I send you the Gazets because of the news there concerning my Lord Montrose, hee is undoubtedly not yet landed in Scotland.⁴

J. SIMMONS

Christ Church, Oxford

LES BEAUX ESPRITS SE RENCONTRENT

Die folgenden Proben aus einer grösseren Sammlung von dichterischen Parallelstellen, die mir gelegentlich bei der Lektüre aufgestossen sind, bitte ich beileibe nicht etwa als Belege geistigen Diebstahls auffassen zu wollen. Es handelt sich vielmehr zum Teil um Falle, bei denen eine direkte Abhängigkeit des späteren Dichters von dem früheren recht unwahrscheinlich ist. So wissen wir z. B. um nur eines anzuführen, zwar von Gerhart Hauptmann, dass er von Jean Pauls *Titan* einen nachhaltigen Eindruck erhalten hat; dass er jedoch die *Grönlandischen Prozesse*, das unlesbarste aller Jean Paulschen Werke, kennen sollte, ist mehr als unwahrscheinlich. Es bleibt natürlich immer die Möglichkeit eines indirekten

published "A. PARIS, Chés Guillaume Sassier, Imprimeur et Libraire ordinaire du Roy, ruë des Cordiers, proche la Sorbonne, aux deux Tourterelles. M. DC. L."

² The negotiation (with the Scots).

³ The draft of the agreement between Charles II and the Scots was signed at Breda on 1 May 1650, the final version on board ship off Heligoland on 11 June (Gardiner, *op. cit.*, 227, 264).

⁴ Montrose landed in Caithness from the Orkneys about 12 April (Buchan, *Montrose*, ed. 1938, 302).

Zusammenhangs durch Mittelglieder oder des Zurückgehens auf eine gemeinsame Quelle offen. Aber das wird sich im einzelnen schwer nachweisen lassen und ist jedenfalls nicht wahrscheinlicher als ein zufälliges Zusammentreffen. Dennoch, ja vielleicht ebendarum scheint mir die Anführung solcher zuweilen verbluffender Uebereinstimmungen nicht ganz uninteressant und überflüssig zu sein. Ich kann natürlich nicht dafür einstehen, dass auf die eine oder andere der folgenden Parallelen nicht schon von anderer Seite aufmerksam gemacht worden ist; auch in diesem Falle wurde es sich nur um ein zufälliges Zusammentreffen, nicht um bewusste Aneignung handeln.

1.

En vérité, si la tête ne m'en tournoit pas, il faudroit qu'elle m'eût déjà tourné
Rousseau, *La nouvelle Héloïse*, IV, 9.

Und glauben Sie mir wer über gewisse Dinge den Verstand nicht verlieret, der hat keinen zu verlieren
Lessing, *Emilia Galotti*, IV, 7.

2.

Sie hatte immer noch von ganzem Herzen gerne ihrem Gemahl einen gewissen Blick hingeworfen; aber das wollte nicht mehr recht gehen;— und bald ware sie auf sich böse geworden, weil sie nicht mehr böse werden konnte.

Blankenburg, *Beiträge zur Geschichte deutschen Reichs und deutscher Sitten* (1775), S. 117.

Allein gewiss, ich war recht böß auf mich,
Dass ich auf euch nicht böser werden konnte.

Goethe, *Faust* I, Garten.

3.

Ev'n such small Critics some regard may claim,
Preserv'd in Milton's or in Shakespear's name.
Pretty! in amber to observe the forms
Of hairs, of straws, or dirt, or grubs, or worms!
The things, we know, are neither rich nor rare,
But wonder how the devil they got there.

Pope, *Epistle to D Arbuthnot*, being the Prologue to the Satires, v. 167-172.

So hat Lessing eben durch seine Polemik manchen Namen der wohlverdientesten Vergessenheit entrissen. Mehrere winzige Schriftstellerlein hat er mit dem geistreichsten Spott, mit dem köstlichsten Humor gleichsam umspinnen, und in den Lessingschen Werken erhalten sie sich nun für ewige Zeiten wie Insekten, die sich in einem Stück Bernstein verfangen. Indem er seine Gegner tötete, machte er sie zugleich unsterblich.

Heine, *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*, II. Buch.

4.

. . . so wie die Franzosen die Herren des Landes, die Engländer die des grossern Meeres, wir [Deutschen] die der beide und alles umfassenden Luft sind. . . Jean Paul, *Friedens-Predigt an Deutschland*, v.

Franzosen und Russen gehört das Land,
Das Meer gehört den Briten,
Wir aber besitzen im Luftreich des Traums
Die Herrschaft unbestritten.

Heine, *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*, VII, 6.

5.

Er nahm sich Zeit dabei [beim Kussen].
Aus diesem einen Kuss hatt' eine Sprode
Zehn Kusse machen können, und ein jeder
Wär' noch ein ganz kompletter Kuss geblieben

Heyse, *Francesca von Rimini*, IV, 1.

. . un dese eine Kuss was en sonderbaren Kuss, denn in desen einen kunn einer mit twolf dividieren, un dat Facit was immer noch en ganzen Kuss.
Reuter, *Ut mine Stromtid*, Kap. 45.

. . und gab mir einen so ungeheuren Kuss, dass sparsame Leute daraus ein Dutzend gemacht haben würden.

H. Seidel, *Reinhard Flemings Abenteuer*, I, 6.

6.

Ich rechne zu meiner Glückseligkeit die Nachbarschaft eines Musensohnes, der auf der Spitze eines Parnasses von fünf Stockwerken weilet, und welchen Bacchus und Venus mit der Schwindsucht beschenkt haben. Wie die Zugvögel kehret seine Krankheit im Frühlinge mit sichtbaren Aeusserungen und mit ihr sein trauriger Gesang zurück. Sobald das Blut seinen Speichel farbt, so wimmert seine genieartige Lunge in Youngischer Melodie. So verkündigen die blutigen Flecken im weissen Kote der Stuben-nachtigall die Ankunft ihres Gesangs.

Jean Paul, *Grönländische Prozesse*, I, 1.

Und ich singe, du hast es gehört, wie ein Nachtigallmännchen
Besser täglich—verzeih diesen ornithologischen Umstand!—
Weil mein Kot täglich reicher von blutigen Flecken durchsetzt ist.

G. Hauptmann, *Till Eulenspiegel*, 11. Gesang.

EDUARD BEREND

Geneva

A NOTE ON MÉRIMÉE'S CORRESPONDENCE

Courmont destroyed the letters which Mérimée wrote him because, as his widow informed Félix Chambon, "le caractère tout intime de ses lettres n'en (permettait) pas la publicité."¹ Technically no doubt, Courmont had the right to destroy what was legally his property, but it was none the less a deplorable act of vandalism.

M. Georges Viollet-le-Duc, whose house in Paris contains so many treasures, very graciously gave me permission to consult his family archives. Among his grandfather's papers, I came upon a note which Courmont received from Mérimée and passed on to Viollet-le-Duc.

When it was written Mérimée and Viollet-le-Duc were planning their trip to England which was to last from May 26² until June 21, 1850.³ Here is the note:

Mon cher ami, le Préfet de Tarn et Garonne nous écrit que les 883 f. que nous avons donnés pour achever le clocher de Caussade, ne suffisent pas pour payer ce qui est dû au S(ieu)r Bédé, entrepreneur (sic) dont le mémoire, pour travaux exécutés, monte à 1479.98. Je ne comprends rien à cette réclamation. En accordant les 883 f. nous croyions faire une grande grâce aux caussadois et terminer complett les travaux. Veuillez me dire ce qu'il en est

Nous avons commission *vendredi*; ainsi je ne pourrai partir que *vendredi* soir ou *samedi* à votre choix. Arrangez votre course d'Amiens s'il se peut en conséquence.

Samedi soir (May 19, 1850).

T(out) à v(ous),
Pr. M.

Mérimée spent a week-end with Lord Stanhope, the historian, at Chevening, Sevenoaks, Kent, in July 1864. There are references which would lead one to believe that the two men exchanged a number of letters.

The present Lord Stanhope, formerly First Lord of the Admiralty, found two short notes at Chevening; he very graciously sent

¹ Cf. Félix Chambon: *Notes sur Prosper Mérimée*, p. 369, note 3.

² Cf. Letter to Mme de Montijo, May 25, 1850.

³ Cf. Letter to Mme Yemeniz, *Revue d'Histoire de Lyon*, 1903, p. 39. Trahard and Connes made a slight mistake, stating that Mérimée and Viollet-le-Duc returned to Paris on June 22, 1850.

me a copy of them, assuring me that there were no other Mérimée autographs among his grandfather's papers. The first Lord Stanhope dated both these notes when he received them.

A M. du Sommerard.

Mon cher ami,

Lord et Lady Mahon désirent visiter votre collection Je regrette fort de ne pouvoir les accompagner—mais je vous prie de vouloir bien leur en faire les honneurs avec votre obligeance ordinaire.

Je sais que Mad du Sommerard va beaucoup mieux.

T(out) à v(ous),

Pr. Mérimée.

Samedi (Oct. 30, 1855).

Lord and Lady Mahon were the parents of the present Lord Stanhope, *Mahon* being the second title of the family. The "Collection," of course, is now to be seen in the Musée de Cluny.

A Lord Stanhope.

My Lord,

Je vous écris de mon lit où me tient la grippe, pour vous dire tous mes regrets de ne pouvoir vous voir aujourd'hui. Veuillez dire au porteur comment est Lady Stanhope, & quand vous partez.

Agréez, My Lord, l'expression de tous mes sentiments dévoués.

Pr. Mérimée.

Mardi (Nov. 7, 1855).

There are a number of unpublished Mérimée autographs in French provincial libraries and in Italy. Often scholars put themselves to expense and great inconvenience to obtain copies only to find the letters *d'une banalité parfaite*. To spare them disappointment I beg to submit the following letters, dull as some of them are:

Bibliothèque Municipale d'Amiens: Legs A. de Marsy, Ms. 1164

Je regrette bien de ne pouvoir accepter votre aimable invitation. J'ai des dames à dîner chez moi mercredi.

Mille amitiés et compl.

Pr. Mérimée.

6 mars 1859.

Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 4530, fol. 11 bis (Collection
Prosper Faugère)

Paris, 52 rue de Lille
16 sept. 1867.

Monsieur,

Je reçois de Londres ce petit imprimé qui vous montrera qu'en Angleterre tous les gens instruits partagent votre opinion au sujet des autographes de Pascal.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de tous mes sentiments de la plus haute considération.

Pr. Mérimée.

Envelope: Monsieur P. Faugère
Ministre Plénipotentiaire,
130 rue de l'Université.

The pamphlet to which Mérimée refers is an open letter from Libri to M. Chasles about the "faux autographes de Pascal" which the latter presented to the Institut de France. The responsibility for the "falsifications" had been attributed to Libri.

Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon. Ms. 1441-42, Vol. 11,
fol. 152.

Mon cher ami,

Veuillez faire tous mes remerciements à Madame votre fille pour son excellent thé. Voici la lettre que m'écrivait M. Damas-Hinard.

Mille amitiés et compl.

Pr. Mérimée

Vendredi (no date or address).

Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon. Ms. 1423, fol. 152

Cher Monsieur,

Je suis monté chez vous pour vous dire que l'académie s'était trouvée en trop petit nombre pour décider la grande question ce matin. Mais vous êtes le seul réservé. J'espère que jeudi nous en finirons.

Veuillez agréer l'expression de tous mes sentiments dévoués

Pr. Mérimée.

Jeudi soir (no date or address).

Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon, Ms. 1423, fol. 156

Cher Monsieur,

Voici la lettre pour M. de Labrador.

Je vous renvoie votre dessin et vous prie d'agréer tous mes remerciements

Pr. Mérimée.

Lundi 15 avril (no year or address).

Bibliothèque de la Ville de Reims, Autographe 11, fol. 1110

Paris, 52 rue de Lille
5 mars (no year).

Monsieur,

Je vous remercie beaucoup de la communication que vous avez bien voulu me faire au sujet de l'arc Antique de Reims. J'espère que les travaux dont vous m'entretenez ne sont pas assez maladroitement dirigés pour inspirer des inquiétudes pour le présent, mais je crains avec vous qu'ils ne compromettent pour l'avenir l'existence même du monument. J'appellerai à (ce) sujet l'attention de la commission des Mons historiques à la première réunion, et en attendant je vais tâcher que Mr le Ministre d'Etat écrive au sous Préfet de veiller avec beaucoup de soin à ce qu'on n'ébranle pas l'arc en le privant du massif auquel il s'appuyait.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de tous mes sentiments de haute considération

Pr Mérimée.

Mr Dugueville (?) à reims.

Bibliothèque de Clermont Ferrand, Ms. 338, fol. 313 Collection
d'autographes de M. de Chazelles

Paris, le 6 janvier à 11 hrs 1832

*Cabinet
du
Ministre du Commerce
et des Travaux Publics*

Monsieur le Directeur Général,

Le Ministre me charge de vous demander la liste des ingénieurs que vous proposez pour la décoration. Il en a besoin, aujourd'hui pour finir son travail sur les croix, il vous serait fort obligé si vous vouliez bien lui envoyer cette liste, ce matin même.

Je suis avec respect, Monsieur le Directeur général
Votre très humble & très obéissant Servr.

Pr. Mérimée.

Bibliothèque de Clermont-Ferrand, Ms. 338, fol. 316

Jeudi (no date)

Mon cher ami,

Je suis revenu depuis q(ue)lq(ue)s jours à Paris et je trouve votre lettre. Le M(aréch)al n'est pas facile à confesser. Il dit que votre fils a eu de l'avancement et que non bis in idem. Que les chefs de corps après l'inspection g(énéra) le lui fassent des propositions—qu'il ne sait auquel entendre etc. Avec tout cela quelques bonnes paroles pour prendre patience. Je crois qu'il faudrait tâcher de lui forcer la main. Peut-être que M. de Chazelle abusant de l'approche des élections ferait bien de le canuler. Quelque chose qui arrive, je serais fort peu d'avis que votre fils jetât le

manche après la cognée. Dans toute carrière les débuts sont pénibles & rien ne se fait qu'avec le temps. Je suis bien fâché que cette remarque ne soit ni neuve ni consolante, mais il ne faut jamais désespérer et après tout il vaut mieux avoir mérité la croix que l'attraper sans l'avoir méritée.

Je suis à faire de la prose pour empêcher que la commission du budget ne nous rogne les ongles, c'est l'usage à ce qu'il paraît de greler sur le persil.

Mille amitiés et compls.

p^r. Mérimée.

I have not seen the originals of the two manuscripts in Clermont-Ferrand, but I believe that the copies which I possess are accurate in every detail.

Collection Cossilla, Biblioteca Civica, Torino, Italy

A Mr Jules Taschereau

à Paris, 31 mars (1848)

Mon cher ami,

Avez-vous reçu quelque réponse à votre lettre relative aux hussards du Grand Frédéric, déposés à la Bibliothèque de Tours?

Ch(arles) d'Aragon m'a prêté deux lettres de Courrier (sic) qu'il m'a autorisé à vous communiquer, si vous les voulez insérer dans la Revue Rétr(ospective). Je les tiens à votre disposition.

Tout à vous,

p^r. M.

Transcribed from a copy of the original letter. *Courrier* is obviously Paul-Louis Courier.

Bibliothèque Thiers, Fonds Baroche,
Lettres Autographes, Ms. 999, M. 2, fol. 125

Paris 19 avril 1852.

Monsieur,

Vous avez bien voulu me permettre de vous envoyer la citation textuelle d'un paragraphe, où, je le crains, vous avez cru que j'avais mis un peu d'invention. Le voici:

L'armoire 6 et l'armoire 7 contenaient des "lettres écrites au duc Bernard de Saxe Weimar par plusieurs personnes (1636 à 1639)"; des "lettres du roi et de la reine au duc de Weimar et du duc de Weimar au roi (1636 à 1639)"; "trois lettres autographes de Hugo Grotius au duc de Saxe en 1636"; enfin des "lettres écrites par le roi ou ses ministres et papiers relatifs aux missions de Mr de Sabran à Genes à Vienne et à Londres."

La liasse renfermant ces dernières lettres est mentionnée dans une note prise par Libri sur la collection Baluze.

"Or, des lettres qui viennent d'être rappelées, un bon nombre ne se retrouvent plus, et on les voit passer dans les ventes Libri. Ainsi on y

rencontre des lettres écrites au duc de Saxe Weimar par 1^o Hugo Grotius, sous la date du 19-29 octobre 1637 . . . etc" "acte d'accusation contre Libri Carrucci, Paris, Panckouke, 1850, 8^o p. 38 ligne 15 et suivantes. Il n'y a que huit lignes d'intervalle entre les deux dates des lettres de Grotius"

Veuillez encore observer, Monsieur, que *la note* de Mr. Libri est une citation du Père Lelong, et indique la situation de la liasse en question, non point à l'époque où Mr. Libri faisait des recherches dans la bibliothèque nationale, mais tout au plus à l'époque où a paru la dernière édition du dictionnaire historique de la France, c. à d. en 1778. Et, puisque j'ai cité le P. Lelong, j'ajouterai qu'on voit dans son livre que déjà en 1778 des papiers qui auraient dû rester dans les archives du royaume, étaient entre les mains de particuliers dont il donne les noms.

Permettez-moi une seconde citation, Monsieur, car je tiens beaucoup à vous prouver que j'ai lu avec attention cet étrange acte d'accusation.

"Une lettre officielle de Libri, écrite en 1841, mentionne un recueil fort important conservé aussi à la Bibliothèque de Montpellier sous la cote H 272. C'est un volume de lettres adressées à Alde Manuce, "volume, dit-il, qui contient une lettre de Tasse (sic) et une de Pierre Arétin." Cette dernière lettre qui portait le n^o 149 a disparu, ce qui a été facile à constater par la pagination et l'inventaire placé en tête du volume. Au catalogue de la vente Libri du 16 avril 1846, on rencontre un article ainsi conçu. "Arétin (Pietro Aretino) lettre autographe à Paul Manuce, célèbre imprimeur" "Nous ne doutons pas, disent les experts, que cette lettre ne soit celle qui devait se trouver dans le volume dont nous nous occupons sous le n^o 149." "Les lettres d'Arétin sont, en effet, très rares et celle qui a été vendue par Libri est précisément comme celle de Montpellier adressée à Manuce." acte d'acc.^{on} p. 46 dernier paragraphe.

Après cette dernière citation, Monsieur, je ne doute pas que vous ne me rendiez la justice de croire que je n'ai nullement chargé le système de logique particulier au juge d'instruction, et peut-être trouverez-vous qu'en attribuant ces énormités à de la *distraktion*, j'ai été indulgent pour leur auteur. Il faut encore dire qu'il y a 6 volumes in 8^o *imprimés* des lettres de l'Arétin, et qu'on trouverait difficilement une collection italienne qui n'en possédât huit ou dix autographes. Mais, pour guide dans l'appréciation de la rareté des autographes, le juge a pris l'ouvrage de Mr. Fontaine, âne bâté s'il en fût, qui place Gabrielle d'Etrées au XV^e siècle, et cite des autographes de Pascal à Dettonville (son pseudonyme).

Je regrette beaucoup, Monsieur, que vous ayez trouvé trop de vivacité dans mon petit factum, mais j'ose espérer qu'un caractère généreux comme le vôtre voudra bien excuser les mouvements involontairement excessifs qui me seraient échappés en voyant entasser les imputations les plus contraires à la vérité contre un ancien confrère, abandonné de tout le monde, parce qu'il s'est permis autrefois de mal parler de Mr. Arago, de l'école des Chartres et des Jésuites. Je serais trop puni de mon ardeur chevaleresque, si vous me retiriez à cette occasion la bienveillance dont vous m'avez toujours honoré.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'expression de tous mes sentiments respectueux et dévoués.

P. Mérimée.

P. S. Je m'aperçois (sic) que j'ai cité l'édition in 8° de l'acte d'accusation. C'est la plus correcte (pour le latin et l'italien; encore!) mais voici les renvois au moniteur du 3 août 1850

1^{re} citation 4^{me} suppl^t au n° 215, page 2695, 1^{re} colonne, 8^e paragraphe.

2^{me} citation p 2696, 1^{re} colonne 5^{me} paragraphe

M. Charles Tirard, Membre de la Commission de la Bibliothèque de Vire, Calvados, informed me with deep regret that a manuscript of Mérimée kept in that library had been stolen or lost. It was, according to M. Tirard, "un certificat attestant que la Bacchanale de Poussin (au Musée de Vire actuellement) avait été achetée par son père à la vente du château de Montmorency." Other Mérimée manuscripts have disappeared from libraries in France; *mériméistes* the world over fervently hope that those who removed them will ultimately get what they so richly deserve—a prison term.

Félix Chambon thought that some day a number of letters addressed to Auguste Aymard, Conservateur des Monuments Historiques de la H^{te} Loire, would come to light. After a long search I found his grandson, Mr. Justice Balme. He wrote, saying,

En dépouillant les vieux papiers de mon grand-père, il me souvient en effet d'avoir retrouvé des lettres de Mérimée, mais il y a de cela quarante ou cinquante ans, mon grand-père étant décédé en 1890. Ces papiers, si ma mémoire est fidèle, étaient relatifs aux visites que Mérimée fit au Puy et aux réparations importantes de la Basilique

His search for Mérimée's letters was fruitless.

As for the letters which Mérimée wrote to Joseph Raoul Auvinet, formerly mayor of Chinon, I discovered his grandson M. Paul Auvinet in Spain, but his answer was rather discouraging:

A ma connaissance, il n'y a qu'une seule lettre de Mérimée; je l'ai eue sous les yeux il y a quelques années en classant de vieilles archives de Chinon. . . . J'avais mis cette lettre soigneusement de côté, tant et si bien que depuis il m'a été impossible de remettre la main dessus.

Mérimée knew Lady Holland well. The Earl of Ilchester informed me that there were two letters from Mérimée in Holland House; he qualified them as "uninteresting," but I could learn nothing more about them. There are undoubtedly references to Mérimée in Lady Holland's famous *Dinner Books*, but I could not obtain permission to consult them.

The correspondence Mérimée had with Lord Ashburton is lost. I attempted to find it through the late Lord Ashburton's agents,

Warmington & Co in Picadilly, but they had no knowledge of the existence of such a correspondence.

A number of letters addressed to Mary Shelley may be found some day; Mrs. Julian Marshall saw them about sixty years ago. I made a long and patient search for them in Britain without any success whatever.

DENNIS M. HEALY

University of Alberta

ZOLA'S *LA JOIE DE VIVRE* AND *LA MORT D'OLIVIER BÉCAILLE*

One of the most distinctive aspects of the psychological makeup of Émile Zola was his constant and irrational fear of death, a fear frankly recognized by Zola himself¹ and noted by most of his biographers. This "épouvante de la mort," as his daughter called it,² seems to have reached an acute stage in 1880, after the death of his mother. Four years later, when he had somewhat recovered from his grief at her loss, he published two works, a novel, *La Joie de vivre*, and a short-story, *La Mort d'Olivier Bécaille*, in which he gave a deeply personal expression to the sufferings he had undergone in the years immediately preceding. It is the purpose of this study to reveal the striking similarity of these two works in their expression of the fear of death and to indicate their strongly autobiographical flavor.

Lazare Chanteau, the young hero of *La Joie de vivre* who is almost certainly sketched in Zola's own image, suffers like his creator from a constant and intense fear of death:

... un sursaut l'éveillait parfois, le mettait debout, les yeux grands d'horreur, les mains jointes, bégayant dans les ténèbres: 'Mon Dieu! mon Dieu!' Sa poitrine craquait, il croyait mourir; et il devait rallumer, il attendait

¹ See especially *Correspondance, 1858-71, Œuvres Complètes* (Paris: Bernouard, 1927-29), XLVIII, 37; and *Journal d'un Convalescent*, published in appendix to *La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret, Œuvres*, VI, 429 ff.

² D. Le Blond-Zola, *Émile Zola Raconté par sa Fille* (Paris: Fasquelle, 1930), 120; see also Dr. E. Toulouse, *Enquête médico-psychologique* . . . (Paris: Société d'Éditions Scientifiques, 1896), 260; *Journal des Goncourt*, entries of 20 February 1883 and 14 February 1885; and Matthew Josephson, *Zola and his Time* (London: Gollancz, 1929), 288-89.

d'être réveillé complètement pour retrouver un peu de calme. Une honte lui restait de cette épouvante. . . .³

Nor does his marriage to the young and beautiful Louise Thibaudier improve Lazare's outlook; the presence of his wife aggravates his fear:

Il ne pouvait dormir sans veilleuse, les ténèbres exaspéraient son anxiété, malgré la continuelle crainte que sa femme ne découvrit son mal. Même il y avait là un redoublement de malaise qui aggravait les crises, car jadis, quand il couchait seul, il lui était permis d'être lâche. Cette créature vivante, dont il sentait la tiédeur à son côté, l'inquiétait. Dès que la peur le soulevait de l'oreiller, aveuglé de sommeil, son regard se portait vers elle, avec la pensée éperdue de la voir les yeux ouverts, fixés tout grands sur les siens . . . une nuit, il la trouva, comme il l'avait redouté si longtemps, les yeux grands ouverts. Elle ne disait rien, elle le regardait grelotter et blêmir. Sans doute, elle aussi venait de sentir passer la mort. . . . Désormais, ils furent hantés tous les deux. Aucun d'eux ne leur échappait, c'était un secret de honte dont il ne fallait point parler.⁴

These words are undoubtedly autobiographical, for Edmond de Goncourt recounts in his *Journal* that Zola declared to him after the death of his mother:

Oui, la mort depuis ce jour, elle est toujours au fond de notre pensée, et bien souvent—nous avons maintenant une veilleuse dans notre chambre à coucher—bien souvent la nuit, regardant ma femme qui ne dort pas, je sens qu'elle pense comme moi à cela, et nous restons ainsi sans jamais faire allusion à quoi nous pensons, tous les deux . . . par pudeur, oui, par une certaine pudeur. . . . Oh! c'est terrible cette pensée—et de la terreur vient à ses yeux—Il y a des nuits, où je saute tout à coup sur mes deux pieds, au bas de mon lit, et je reste, une seconde, dans un état d'épouvante indicible.⁵

La Mort d'Olivier Bécaille contains some notable similarities in its expression of the fear of death. Olivier, like Lazare Chanteau, seems to reflect the fears of Zola himself when he cries: "Que de fois, la nuit, je me suis réveillé en sursaut, ne sachant quel souffle avait passé sur mon sommeil, joignant les mains avec désespoir, balbutiant: 'Mon Dieu! mon Dieu! il faut mourir!'"⁶ And Olivier suffers, as Zola had and as Lazare had also, at the presence of his wife:

³ *La Joie de vivre*, *Œuvres*, *xiii*, 91-92; see also 136, 214-17.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 275-76.

⁵ *Journal des Goncourt*, entry of 6 March 1882.

⁶ *La Mort d'Olivier Bécaille*, *Œuvres*, *xxvi*, 150-51.

Dans les premiers mois de notre mariage, lorsqu'elle dormait la nuit à mon côté, lorsque je songeais à elle en faisant des rêves d'avenir, sans cesse l'attente d'une séparation fatale gâtait mes joies, détruisait mes espoirs. Il faudrait nous quitter, peut-être demain, peut-être dans une heure . . . le pis de ce tourment, c'est qu'on l'endure dans une honte secrète. On n'ose dire son mal à personne . . . car on ne parle pas de la mort, pas plus qu'on ne prononce certains mots obscènes. On a peur d'elle jusqu'à ne point la nommer.⁷

These close similarities in idea and in expression indicate two conclusions with respect to Zola's methods of composition. The first is that he did not hesitate to reproduce a vivid scene or striking passage if the necessities of the work at hand so required. The second and more important is that he evidently did not scruple to incorporate into his novels his own experiences, memories and sensations if he felt that they were called for by the needs of the characters or the intrigue. The part of autobiography in the ensemble of his work cannot be disregarded.

ROBERT J. NIESS

Mundelein College

L'ATTAQUE DU MOULIN IN AMERICAN TRANSLATION

Of the many short stories by Emile Zola that have been translated into English and published in this country, *L'Attaque du Moulin*, to judge by the number¹ of times that it appeared, was the most

¹ *Ibid.*, 151.

² Eleven for a certainty. It usually formed one story of a collection and only once, to my knowledge, was it published by itself.

1. In *The Mysteries of Marseilles* as *The Miller's Daughter*. Translated by George D. Cox, Peterson, Philadelphia, 1882.
2. In *The Flower Girls of Marseilles* as *The Miller's Daughter*. Translated and published as # 1, 1888.
3. In *Tales of Today and Other Days*. Translated by E. P. Robins, Cassell, New York, 1891.
4. *The Attack on the Mill and Three Sketches of War*. No translator given. Stokes, New York, 1894.
5. In *Jacques Damour*. Translated by William F. Apthorp, Copeland and Day, Boston, 1895.
6. In *Stories by Foreign Authors*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1898. The Zola translation is the one listed in # 5 directly above.
7. *The Attack on the Mill by Emil Zola and Other Stories from French*

popular. As a rule the English versions reproduce, with varying degrees of excellence, the story as Zola wrote it. A notable exception, however, is *The Miller's Daughter*, first published by Peterson, and later, twice, by Black as indicated in the note.

In this exception Cox, the translator, has written a new ending to the story, a happy one, beginning with the words "Victory! Victory!" with which Zola had ended it. Naturally, in order to do this, he has been obliged to modify somewhat the preceding narration. Père Merlier is not killed, but receives only a slight wound. Then, in describing the situation in the mill as the victorious French enter, where Zola has "When Françoise turned around, Dominique was lying on the ground, his breast pierced with twelve bullets," Cox says "When Françoise looked, Dominique lay upon the ground, with blood streaming from his neck and shoulders." This sentence obviously leaves the way clear for a happy dénouement, which is brought about when the French captain who leads his victorious troops into the courtyard discovers that Dominique is not dead but severely wounded. The surgeon is sent for, Dominique recovers, and the final sentence sums the matter up: "The mill was rebuilt, and Père Merlier had a new wheel upon which to bestow whatever tenderness was not engrossed by his daughter and her husband."

This, then, is the commonplace form in which many Americans have read, and still read, Zola's finest *conte*. It throws quite a light on the taste of the American reading public of the late nineteenth century. It is rather remarkable, too, that as recently as a few years ago, an American publisher should have brought out such a wretched translation.

MALCOLM BANCROFT JONES

Connecticut College for Women

-
- Masters*. This is # 3 above, but published by Brentano, New York, 1900.
8. *The Attack on the Mill*. No translator given. People's Pocket Series The Appeal to Reason. Girard, Kansas, 1921 (?).
- 9 and 10. In *The Works of Emile Zola*. One volume edition. No translator given. By no means complete. It does contain, however, *The Miller's Daughter*. Translated as indicated in # 1 above. Walter J. Black, New York, 1928 and 1938.
11. In *Stories from Emile Zola*. Translated by Lafcadio Hearn, with a preface by Albert Mordell, Stechert, New York, 1935.

WHEN DID TENNYSON MEET HALLAM?

In the absence of any statement in the Tennyson *Memoir* as to when Tennyson and Hallam met, biographers and commentators have taken the view stated by Churton Collins. "When he [Hallam] first met Tennyson is not recorded, but it was probably in his first term, the autumn of 1828."¹ I wish to suggest that the meeting has been recorded, by Tennyson himself, in Sections xxii and xlvi of *In Memoriam*; and in support of the *In Memoriam* date of April, 1829, I cite an unpublished letter from Hallam to W. E. Gladstone.

The relevant stanzas are, first, these from Section xxii:

The path by which we twain did go,
Which led by tracts that pleased us well,
Thro' four sweet years arose and fell,
From flower to flower, from snow to snow;
And we with singing cheer'd the way,
And, crown'd with all the season lent,
From April on to April went,
And glad at heart from May to May.
But where the path we walk'd began
To slant the fifth autumnal slope,
As we descended following Hope,
There sat the Shadow fear'd of man;

and, secondly, the verse in the third stanza of Section xlvi:

And those five years its richest field,

which takes up the sense of "the fifth autumnal slope" of the preceding passage. Although commentators have deduced the year 1828 from these passages,² they seem clearly to say, "Our friendship, beginning in April, 1829, proceeded smoothly for four years; but as the fifth autumn, i. e., the autumn of 1833, arrived, Death came on September 15, 1833. I therefore look back upon the five years, 1829-1833, as the richest of my life."

The *In Memoriam* date seems to me quite unassailable. To any who would suggest that the lines indicate May as plausibly as April, it can be said that several considerations favor April. First, it is April, traditionally celebrated by poets as the month of the beginnings of things, that had always for Tennyson a special and

¹ John Churton Collins, *In Memoriam, The Princess, and Maud*, London, 1902, p. 4. Cf. also *Alfred Lord Tennyson: a memoir*, by his son, London, 1897, I, 33-5.

² Especially, for its influence on others, the Eversley Edition of *In Memoriam*, ed. by Hallam, Lord Tennyson, London, 1909, p. 230.

poignant quality which the reader can investigate for himself, concordance in hand. Secondly, poems submitted for the University Prize were called in in April, and it is possible that the two authors of poems called "Timbuctoo" may have been thrown together in connection with this competition. Thirdly, the sonnet of Hallam's to Tennyson, beginning "Oh last in time, but worthy to be first," bore the date, when first printed in Hallam's *Poems* of 1830, of May, 1829, and seems unlikely to have been composed without a bit more testing of a new friendship than would have been the case had the friendship begun in May.

The only other evidence bearing upon the meeting is a sentence written by Hallam to Gladstone from Trinity, February 22, 1829:³ "I live here, principally in what may be termed the 'metaphysical set,' many of whom are men of great talents, but in none of whom, if I except Frere, one of the best creatures that ever breathed, have I found a *true friend*." In this statement we find irrefutable evidence that Hallam and Tennyson were not friends before February 22, 1829, and we must accept the statement in spite of the theoretical unlikelihood that both men could be known to Richard Monckton Milnes, one of the "metaphysical set," and not known to each other, or that other unlikelihood, that although both students had William Whewell for tutor, they passed six months at Trinity without becoming friends. But we recall that Edward Fitzgerald was at Trinity and did not know his fellow-collegian, Tennyson.

Only one piece of evidence could be plausibly adduced against the *In Memoriam* date of April, 1829. There exists in the so-called Allen Manuscript at Trinity College, Cambridge, an unpublished sonnet composed by Tennyson and amended by Hallam. It is written out in Hallam's hand, with the note: "N. B. I had some hand in the worst part of this sonnet. A. H. H.," and it is dated, in Hallam's hand, 1828. In the light of the other evidence just presented, it seems obvious that Hallam was there noting the date of Tennyson's original composition, since that part of the Allen Manuscript consists of poems by Tennyson copied out by Hallam.⁴

³ The letter is among the Gladstone Papers at the British Museum, to which I had access through the kindness of their curator, Mr. A. T. Bassett.

⁴ This sonnet, in another hand, is also part of the so-called Heath Manuscript at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, where the date, 1832, is crossed out. The sonnet will appear in my forthcoming edition of Hallam's writings.

T. H. VAIL MOTTER

HOUSMAN, DEHMEL AND DANTE

In a recent note on "Housman's *More Poems*, VII and Dehmel's *Trost*" (*MLN*, LVI, 215-217), Mr. E. B. Gladding points out an interesting parallel between the two poems. Both express the idea that a falling star leaves no gap in heaven:

No star is lost at all
From all that star-sown sky.

Sieh, kein Stern verschwand:
alle leuchten noch allen.

There seems to be no likelihood of connection between the two poems. In considering the possibility of a common source, Mr. Gladding mentions meteors in Heine, Claudius and Brentano, and concludes: "The idea that although a star fell, 'no star is lost,' however, is peculiar to Housman and Dehmel."

A possible *common* source may be found in Dante, with whom both poets were familiar. This particular idea is expressed in a celebrated passage of the *Paradiso* (xv, 13-18):

Quale per li seren tranquilli e puri
discorre ad ora ad or subito foco,
movendo li occhi che stavan sicuri,
e pare stella che tramuti loco,
se non che dalla parte ond' el s'accende
nulla sen perde, ed esso dura poco.

Housman, at least, was certainly familiar with a passage in Ovid (*Met.*, II, 319-322) which Vernon cites as a possible source for Dante:¹

At Phaeton, rutilos flammae populante capillos,
Volvitur in praeceps, longoque per aera tactu
Fertur, ut interdum de coelo stella sereno
Etsi non cecidit, potuit cecidisse videri.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

¹ W. W. Vernon, *Readings on the Paradiso*, London, Methuen, 1909, I, 491.

REVIEWS

American Renaissance Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. By F. O. MATTHIESSEN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. xxvi + 678. \$5.00.

Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle. By WASHINGTON IRVING. Edited by STANLEY WILLIAMS. Published for the Facsimile Text Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xxx + 67. \$1.60.

Sidney Lanier. Poet and Prosodist. By RICHARD WEBB and EDWIN R. COULSON. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1941. Pp. xvii + 108. \$2.00.

American Fiction, 1920-1940. By JOSEPH WARREN BEACH. New York: Macmillan, 1941. Pp. x + 371. \$2.50.

Matthiessen's *American Renaissance* is the most ambitious attempt in the field of American literary criticism since Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought* (1927), but it fails in its aims "to do for the understanding of our literature what Parrington did for the understanding of our liberal thought." Differing in aim and scope, this volume of over 300,000 words is an intensive examination, from the standpoint of aesthetics, of the major productions of Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne, Melville, and Whitman—with special emphasis on the Golden Age of the Enlightenment, the 1850's. In its analysis of the masterpieces produced in this most fertile period of our past it is more successful than in its larger purpose of synthesis. For in spite of an elaborate structure, it lacks the clarity of organization that made Parrington such a beacon-light for the re-interpretation of America's cultural heritage; and in spite of its freshness of approach, it lacks the challenge that made *Main Currents* a banner for the liberals and a stimulus even to the belletristic conservatives.

Matthiessen's first shortcoming as a critic, therefore, is that his method is one of "indirection," of circling about his quarry instead of coming straight to the kill. Whatever of structure there is in this volume is symphonic—proper enough for the artist, but not for the critic, since it puts the reader to the necessity of a double interpretation. This circuitousness is symbolized in the choice of illustrations, the majority of which in their subject matter bear no relation whatsoever to the text, but, being photographs and genre paintings, are supposed to illustrate Emerson's conception of "the camera as 'a powerful symbol for his age's scrutiny of character'" and "the

advance of open-air painting [that] came from a response to nature analogous to that expressed in *Walden* and *Leaves of Grass*." And though the author does not often wander so far astray in the composition of his text, his paragraphs and even whole chapters are all too frequently composed of "infinitely repellent particles" (as Emerson confessed of his own). The critic's mind should be a lens, and his method that of focus, whereby he selects details for minute examination and then broadens his scope to include the whole panorama. But even a close study of the present volume yields a somewhat nebulous and fragmentary harvest, such as one brings away from a discursive if brilliant evening of literary conversation.

A second shortcoming in *American Renaissance* is Matthiessen's thesis, which is not only too narrow to be convincing as a basic formulation about the nature of literature, but somehow lacks the vigor (either in itself or in its presentation) to serve as a manual for the pros or to stimulate debate from the cons. Influenced by Joyce, Yeats, and especially T. S. Eliot, the author adopts the theory of art as craftsmanship rather than of art as inspiration, the bald statement of which most modern students will perhaps accept. But the present reviewer, for one, finds it an almost empty formula when it virtually excludes from consideration the value of content—social, religious, political, and human—and thus arrives at such conclusions as: "Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman all conceived of themselves primarily as poets, though, judged strictly by form, none of them was." Further, Emerson's idealism makes him take rank below Whitman, who better bridged the gap between the ideal and the material by putting his emphasis on the latter; and, stranger yet, Matthiessen finds in Thoreau's achievement rather than in Emerson's "the actual glory," since like the seventeenth-century metaphysicians and like Eliot today he "kept the truth at once to the senses and to the intellect." But the attempt to find the roots of modern functionalism in Whitman's extension of Coleridge's organic style is not altogether convincing, and the detailed analysis of *Walden* to prove it "the firmest product in our literature of such life-giving analogies between the processes of art and daily work" is even less so. Matthiessen's chief contribution to our understanding of these three authors lies in his careful collection of their scattered dicta concerning the nature and function of literature; his chief weakness lies in his being turned aside from the fulfillment of his promise to measure "the degree to which their practice bore out their theories" by the temptation to measure their works by a restricted modern rule-of-thumb.

Following the dogma of the artist as trained craftsman, Matthiessen naturally places the greatest emphasis upon Hawthorne of all the group. But, in spite of a convincing exposition of his art in the structure and symbolism of his acknowledged masterpieces, the strictly aesthetic approach fails to emphasize with proper severity

the pale substance of the lesser allegories. Far more valuable is the critic's tracing out in the whole body of Hawthorne's works his major preoccupation with the fate of the individual who is isolated from society. And from this point he moves on to the most original contribution in the entire volume: that equally important as the transcendental affirmation was its counterstatement by the tragic writers, Melville as well as Hawthorne, who saw life more clearly and more completely than the other three because they were aware of not merely the good but the evil in humanity, because they had experienced not merely the mystery but the black tragedy of the natural world. Thus we come to the fullest and soundest exposition of *Moby Dick* in print, including the only sane interpretation of its symbolism yet written. But, even here, in the somewhat strained analogy to the drama of Shakespeare, there crops up again the tendency to elevate Melville beyond his actual achievements, apparently the inevitable tendency of the present generation with its over-emphasis on despair. And this brings us to a final criticism on the score of omission. Granting the thesis of the artist as trained craftsman, not even a paragraph of devious explanation can justify the omission of Poe, who is admittedly (through Baudelaire and the symbolists) the parent stem of modern American and English poetry, according to that theory of art.

After all deductions have been made, however, Matthiessen must be credited with having fulfilled the critic's primary but rarely fulfilled obligation: a fresh and thorough re-examination of the actual productions of major authors. And the student of American letters is indebted to him for counterbalancing the current pre-occupation with biography and literary history without neglecting the fruits of recent scholarship, though the notes are largely explanatory rather than documentary.

The nine literary "letters" on New York manners and the New York stage in 1802-1803, Washington Irving's first production written at the age of nineteen, are gathered together for the first time by Stanley Williams for the Facsimile Text Society. Eight of them are reproduced from the pirated American edition of 1824; these have been variously reprinted and long known to scholars, though not conveniently available. The ninth is now first reprinted from the New York *Morning Chronicle*, where they all appeared originally. The editor's capable introduction throws all the light on them that could be wished even by the complete Irvingite.

The title essay in the Lanier volume was awarded the Porter Prize in 1903, when Richard Webb was a student at Yale. It has never before been printed, and the chief justification for publishing it now is that it is the pioneer piece of extended Lanier criticism, antedating by two years his first biography. It is thorough, in that it surveys the body of Lanier's prose as well as his poetry. But it has the fault of all Lanier criticism until recent years: special

pleading because of the charm of the author's personality and the pathos of his career, rising at times to the rhapsodic. Webb puts his finger nicely upon Lanier's principal weakness—failure to keep his "imagination under the control of regulative reason" and the affectation, obscurity, and straining after sound effects which resulted from a too conscious purpose of proving his musical theory of verse; and he points out convincingly Lanier's chief strength as his nature poems, especially the previously unsung aspects of the southern scene that he knew best, cornfields and marshes. But the detailed criticisms are disappointing, however remarkable for a college student.

To bring the picture down to date, Edwin Coulson has supplied the second essay on "Lanier's Place as American Poet and Prosodist," purporting to survey the influence of Lanier's poetry and poetic theory during the last half century. Of the two dozen modern poets consulted, only Witter Bynner confessed Lanier as an influence. (Hamlin Garland's enthusiasm is beside the point since he is negligible as a poet, and the discipleship of such unknowns as Edward Harris and Evelyn Watson is of no importance.) Allen Tate, DuBose Heyward, Josephine Pinckney, Hervey Allen, Conrad Aiken, W. R. Benét, Harriet Monroe, James Weldon Johnson, and George Dill find no influence of Lanier's poetry on their own or on that of other moderns; and Edna Millay, J. G. Fletcher, Countee Cullen, Langston Hughes, Robinson Jeffers, Edgar Lee Masters, Carl Sandburg, and half-a-dozen lesser lights apparently made no comment worth recording. Mr. Coulson missed his most fruitful field of influence in the work of Carman, Hovey, Moody, and Lindsay. Lanier's theory of verse has fared better, for nearly all students of prosody since his day, both English and American, have acclaimed his pioneer work, with more or less of acceptance. More important than academic eulogy, however, would be the testimony of poets themselves. Mr. Coulson records the high opinion of Harriet Monroe and the judgment of Robert Hillyer that the influence of Lanier's theory has been "strong but indirect." But he overlooks the deliberate rejection of Lanier by Robert Frost in favor of his own theory of the "sound of sense"; and in the free verse controversy started by the Imagists about 1915 he should have found his most significant material.

Bringing his wide knowledge of past literature to bear upon those American authors who are shaping the trends of fiction today, Professor Beach has written the sanest and most comprehensive volume of criticism in the field. The eight novelists he has chosen—Dos Passos, Hemingway, Faulkner, Wolfe, Caldwell, Marquand, Farrell, and Steinbeck—are those that seem to him most worthy of thoughtful consideration and most representative of the harassed generation that has sought to give utterance to the disillusionment, bewilderment, and disorder in the interval between two world wars.

The majority of their seventy-odd volumes are treated in great detail, from Dos Passos's *One Man's Initiation—1917* (1920) to Hemingway's current best seller, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940). To the more common critical talent of careful analysis, Professor Beach adds the rarer one of illuminating synthesis; and his broad survey leads him to the enthusiastic conclusion that no period group of American novelists can match these for unusual gift and artistic distinction. The lay reader who has merely followed the careers of these authors in desultory fashion will not be inclined to accept at once the high significance which he attaches to them. But this reviewer, at least, is sufficiently stimulated, even in this one point of disagreement, to look forward to a re-reading and a re-evaluation.

In spite of their diversity, Professor Beach finds all of these eight novelists genuinely typical of their period—formed by and reflecting in their fiction the cynicism bred by the first world war (in which four of them were participants), the unscrupulous commercialism which followed it, the unsettlement and general decay of society leading up to the present *débâcle*. They are overwhelmingly naturalistic in philosophy and "resolutely determined to place men's spiritual states squarely in the framework of material conditions and social relationships." By calling them "Marxian materialists" he does not mean to brand them as doctrinaire sociologists, ridden by a rigid theory of economics; the phrase simply refers to their "disposition to trace back states of mind and moral attitudes" to the economic and industrial conditions of the character's environment. One and all they are "too much concerned with how a man feels within himself to be content with any exclusive consideration of his material well-being." Indeed, their preoccupation with rendering the very essence of human experience has taken the place of the traditional story interest in their fiction, to the discomfiture of the "bourgeois" reader, who is also shocked by their disposition to show human nature in a distinctly unflattering light.

Any brief survey of such a volume is bound to be misleading, however, for Professor Beach's main purpose is not to interpret the group as a whole (introduction and epilogue) but to present the "whole picture" of eight separate shelves of distinctive modern fiction (two chapters to each novelist). And the critical significance of these careful studies belies his modest disclaimer: "I [merely] wish to make them heard, to understand them and appreciate them. My aim is not primarily critical."

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

The Johns Hopkins University

An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum. By ELEANOR KELLOG HENNINGHAM. New York: Published by the Author, 1939. Pp. 83. \$1.00. (New York University Doctoral Dissertation.)

A masterpiece of medieval Latin poetry is here printed for the first time by Dr. Henningham, complete with a scholarly and illuminating study of the individual poem and its place in the Body and Soul debate *genre*. The text is from the only known copy of the poem, the British Museum MS Royal 7 A III. In addition to the text, notes, and account of the manuscript, Dr. Henningham gives an essay on "The Royal Debate as an Isolated Poem" and another on "The Royal Debate as a Part of the Body and Soul Literature."

Dr. Henningham shows that this twelfth century Royal debate, neglected hitherto by most scholars, holds a central position in Body and Soul literature. As proved by extensive parallels and by similarity of the order of ideas, it is the source of the Old French *Un Samedi par Nunt*, and, through the *Samedi*, of an Old Norwegian homily (*Visio Sancti Pauli apostoli*, preserved in the *Gammel Norsk Homiliebog*, Copenhagen, Royal Library, *Codex Arn. Magn. 619 Quarto*) and probably of an Old Castilian fragment ("Fragmento de un Poema Castellano Antiquo. Archivo histórico nacional -Oña. IV. 380, Siglo XIII"). It is also, on the basis of parallel passages, "one of the sources of—and probably the chief suggestion for—the *Noctis sub Silencio Tempore Brumali*," or *Visio Philiberti*, the most famous of medieval Latin debates. Thus it takes the place of Batiouchkof's hypothetical original, *O*, for these four poems (Batiouchkof not having had access to the Royal debate), and leads to a revision of Batiouchkof's theory of the relationship between these four debate poems and the early homilies which contain Body and Soul material. For Batiouchkof considered (*Romania*, xx, 1-55, 513-78) that the Body and Soul debate developed from the *exemplum* in *memento-mori* sermons in which the soul reproaches the body—developed from this *single-speech exemplum* by the addition of extraneous debate elements; whereas the Royal debate, consisting of one speech by the soul and a reply by the body, is most closely related to the *two-speech exemplum* (accusation by soul and reply by body) preserved in the Irish Homily xxxvi in the *Leabhar Breac*, so that Dr. Henningham suggests the hypothesis that the Body and Soul debates "represent a gradual expansion of the two speeches of the accusation-reply *exemplum*," the true debate form not being attained until the *Visio Philiberti*. The *single-speech exemplum* is then to be connected more directly with the poetic addresses, such as the Old English *Address of the Soul to Its Body*. The Royal debate also had a direct influence on the well known Middle English *Desputisoun bitwen þe Bodi and þe Soule*.

Considering the Royal debate as an isolated poem, Dr. Henningham, in addition to noting its resemblance to the Irish Homily, points out numerous classical allusions, and borrowings from the Vulgate and St. Anselm, indicative of the unknown author's wide learning. This author was probably a well-educated churchman. The meter is a seven syllable trochaic line rimed in couplets, a meter used by Abelard. The date of composition is between 1098 (date of St. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, glanced at in a passage) and the end of the twelfth century (date of the Royal MS). As for literary merit, Dr. Henningham agrees with Professor Raby's remark (*Secular Latin Poetry*, II, 302) that the Royal debate is "on the whole superior to the famous *Visio Philiberti*." The Royal debate, she points out, "brings together a wealth of ideas in such a way as to leave an impression of complete unity, both of structure and tone. For all its length [2544 lines] and elaborateness the reader always knows exactly where he is. . . . Within the larger frame, moreover, the poem presents a series of clearly defined and forceful pictures." One of the most eloquent passages in the poem, in the reviewer's opinion, is the soul's brief, despairing lament following the body's reply, a lament climaxed by the lines (2241-2)

O natura hominis
nunc dei. nunc demonis,

which suggest Pascal's magnificent "Grandeur et misère de l'homme," or, contemporary with the Royal poet, St. Bernard's interpretation of the Delphic Oracle's "Know thyself," and the whole development of Christian Socratism underlying Pascal.

The reviewer would enter caveats on only two relatively unimportant points. On page 42 one of the arguments that Dr. Henningham gives to prove that the Royal debate is the source of the *Visio Philiberti* and not, as has sometimes been held, an imitation, is unconvincing. Dr. Henningham observes that "Many of the words, especially of the more striking words, common to the two poems stand in rime position or at the beginning of the line in the Royal debate but are shifted to less important positions in the *Noctis*," and proceeds to argue that "Borrowing of this type is precisely what occurs when a poet works with the knowledge of another poem in the back of his mind. The words which have impressed him deeply . . . are those which in the original received emphasis from their metrical position." But many lines of the Royal debate contain only two words. In the first thirty lines, for example, there are six lines containing only two words, and of the other lines only eleven contain any word other than pronouns, prepositions, particles, and auxiliaries in the middle of the line. No matter which poet was the borrower, words from the beginning and end of the short lines of the Royal would appear in the middle of the longer lines of the *Visio Philiberti*. On page 15 Dr. Henningham speaks of the Royal author's interest in theological

questions, as shown by his vocabulary, which is "shot through with the technical terms of twelfth century theology." But the four terms she gives as examples all occur within 160 lines of each other, three of them in a passage which is, as Dr. Henningham points out, probably a reference to St. Anselm's doctrine of the Atonement. The rest of the poem, as compared with works like *Piers Plowman* and Usk's *Testament of Love*, can hardly be said to be "shot through" with theological terms. *Necessitas, rectitudo, liberum arbitrium, summum bonum, essentia, substantia* (in the technical sense) are a few common terms that are missing. On this same page Dr. Henningham might have given a clearer explanation of the Royal debate's reference to St. Anselm's doctrine of the Atonement in lines 2337-2392 (lines 2385-92, cf. 2403-4, suggest the patristic ransom theory rather than Anselm's) together with more references to pertinent passages in St. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* (e. g., the emphasis on the 'intrinsic adequacy' of the satisfaction offered by Christ in lib. II, capp. 14 and 20, might be the source for the Soul's sophistical argument that damnation of men after Christ's Atonement is unjust).

There are typographical errors on p. 12, l. 20 (*speechs*), p. 13, l. 12 (*if for of*), p. 16, l. 30 (capitalization for *last of Last Judgment*), p. 43, f. n. 7 (*Walter for Walther*). Annotation of the text consists chiefly of parallels from the Vulgate. More patristic parallels might have been given, e. g., of St. Bernard, *Brevis Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*, cap. 22, to lines 2241-2 quoted above, and of St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, par. 23, and *De Civitate Dei*, lib. XXII, cap. 19, to lines 1195-1208 (the condition of resurrected bodies of the just). I checked a number of footnote references and quotations without finding any errors.

On the whole Dr. Henningham has given us a careful edition of an important poem, and a thorough and original study of the whole field of Body and Soul literature.

GEORGE SANDERLIN

University of Maine

Sir William Temple, The Man and His Work. By HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE. New York: Modern Language Association, 1940. Pp. xii + 361. (Monograph Series, xii.)

Sir William Temple: Three Essays. With an Introduction and Notes by F. J. FIELDEN. Oxford University Press, Indian Branch, 1939. Pp. 139.

Homer E. Woodbridge's study of Sir William Temple, *The Man and his Work*, destroys a number of the false assumptions which have gathered around the name of one of the most distinguished

men of the latter seventeenth century. Thomas Peregrine Courteney's life of Temple, written over a century ago, and brilliantly advertised by Macaulay's review of it, launched the tradition, which has been accepted by every scholar since then, that Temple, who was applauded by all of Europe for the part he played in the Triple Alliance, nursed his wounded pride in his terraced garden when it became evident that no treaty against France could withstand the duplicity of Charles. That this simplified interpretation of an unusually original and varied personality is in fact a caricature becomes abundantly clear as one pursues Mr. Woodbridge's study of the career of Temple. Temple first showed his powers as a diplomat by winning the charming Dorothy Osborn after a courtship lasting nine years and discouraged by both families. After his marriage he was appointed Ambassador to the United Provinces and, with the same energy, frankness, and intelligence, won over the great Dutch statesman, John DeWitt, to the side of England, thus clearing the way for the Triple Alliance, which, for a time at least, curbed the imperialistic designs of Louis XIV. When the Alliance failed, Temple withdrew to his estate at Sheen, not to sulk but to busy himself with his pen, in his untiring effort to discourage the secret understanding between Charles and Louis. It was at this time that he wrote *Upon the Origin and Nature of Government*, *Upon the Conjuncture of Affairs in October, 1673*, and *Observations Upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands*, all of which Mr. Woodbridge convincingly argues were written in support of the cause which finally, through the good offices of Temple, came to a triumphant conclusion in the marriage of William and Mary.

Macaulay's ridicule of the part Temple played in the "ancient-modern" controversy is responsible for a second false assumption. Mr. Woodbridge points out that Macaulay's own lack of historical method made it quite impossible for him to understand the relation of Temple's much-discussed *Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning* to his historical and political writing. Nor could he appraise the general state of knowledge of Temple's day, or appreciate the originality of Temple's ideas on progress, which lay behind his obvious errors in fact. It is, indeed, "the extraordinarily suggestive and seminal quality of Temple's thinking in general" that is his chief claim to importance as the most significant link between the essay-mind of Montaigne and that of his nineteenth-century descendant, Charles Lamb. With sensitive critical insight, disciplined by a thorough study of Temple's literary sources, Mr. Woodbridge points out the originality in Temple's essays, which connects him with the tastes and attitudes of later generations.

Mr. Woodbridge paints an unforgettable picture of a seventeenth-century personality, which one hopes will obliterate forever the crude sketch of the practical minded and dogmatic Macaulay, who was temperamentally incapable of understanding Temple's "scepti-

cal individualism" and his urbane enjoyment of his family and his friends, his collections and his garden. Mr. Woodbridge finds no evidence whatever for the tale that Stella was Temple's illegitimate daughter, nor for the myth of Swift's unhappiness in Temple's home. Lady Giffard's *Life and Character of Sir William Temple*, in fact, proves to be a surprisingly reliable basis for our reading of Temple's character. The personal qualities which she emphasizes are, indeed, those which emerge from Mr. Woodbridge's extensive study of all the evidence. Lady Giffard, says Mr. Woodbridge, "reveals to us the source of Temple's extraordinary personal charm, —his frankness, his warmth of feeling, his mercurial temper, his lively humor and fancy, his love of children, his delight in music and art, his generosity, and the ideal of truth; and at the same time the faults of his qualities, —his occasional moodiness and depression, his intolerance of restraint, the laziness of his later years, his strong personal prejudices, his keen sensitiveness to injuries, his intolerance of pain. It is a very human and intelligible portrait that she draws of a vivid and lovable personality." Mr. Woodbridge's analysis of the qualities of Lady Giffard's work might well be applied to Temple's latest and most intelligent biographer by the mere substitution of a pronoun. Mr. Woodbridge "is scrupulously honest; he knows exactly what Temple's faults were, and though he bears lightly on them he makes them perfectly clear. At the same time, of course, he emphasizes the positive side of his character and particularly those traits which his later biographers have somehow contrived to miss, and which really made him what he was; in short, he goes to the root of the matter of biography."

The need for such a biography as that of Mr. Woodbridge is clearly felt by the reader of a useful little edition of three of Temple's essays, *Of Poetry, Of Popular Discontents, and Of Health and Long Life*, which unfortunately was published a year before Mr. Woodbridge's study. Mr. F. J. Fielden, in his conscientious little introductory essay, also notes the inadequacy of Macaulay's interpretation of Temple's character, but, for lack of information, is unable to support a more satisfactory analysis.

CLARA M. KIRK

Rutgers University

Shelley. By NEWMAN IVEY WHITE. 2 vols. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1940. Pp. xvi + 748, x + 642 + cxlvii. \$12.50.

In undertaking a new full-length biography of Shelley, Professor White was faced by a responsible task. To avoid mere repetition of Dowden and Peck, to assess and interpret the mass of other pub-

lished material—these alone were difficult achievements. But Mr. White has done more than this to justify the publication of his two large volumes. He presents interesting and significant new material, such as the supposed portrait of Shelley by Edward Williams and a convincing solution of the mystery of his "Neapolitan daughter." He has explored unpublished sources, such as Claire's journal and the privately printed *Shelley and Mary*, used by Dowden too circumspectly and by Peck not at all. He was privileged to see and draw from the proofs of Professor Gordon's *Shelley Letters*, publication of which has been delayed. He has put into their setting the results of recent research. He has investigated more thoroughly than anyone else periodical comment on Shelley, and to what he has already published in *The Unextinguished Hearth* he has added here a valuable chapter on "Shelley's Posthumous Reputation." The failure to examine the reserved Bodleian collection, long open to scholars—though such an examination might have resulted in little more than the correction of certain textual misreadings—seems the only serious gap in an otherwise thorough exploration of available sources. And Mr. White's long study of the already familiar material as well as of that which is new or little used has led to a fresh interpretation of Shelley's life, character, philosophy, and art. A few errors in fact, none of them significant, have been corrected in the second printing.

A comparison of almost any given portion of Mr. White's biography with the corresponding chapters in those by Dowden and Peck will show the extent to which he has been able to enlarge our knowledge and our understanding of Shelley. Chapters XIII and XIV, for example, include extended quotations from Claire's journal, material drawn from Shelley's "lost" letters to Harriet, an interpretation—not a mere narrative—of the scheme to abduct and convert Shelley's sisters, a critical use of contemporary articles and reviews and of the prose fragments of 1815, an account and interpretation, based on Professor Gordon's book, of the proposed experiment in free union between Mary and Hogg.

As a biographical narrative this book is very readable. The style is fresh: Mr. White wrote from the sources, using previous biographies only to check what he had already written. The narrative is integrated, showing the development of Shelley's character around the central theme of his "passion for reforming the world"; it has the artistic unity of good biographical fiction with no taint of "fictionized biography." The thousand pages of text may be read as an absorbing study of Shelley's life without the appendices and the notes, which furnish for the scholar the requisite documentation. Yet he would be a strong-minded "general reader" who could resist the lure of the italicized index numbers that point to notes containing "additional information or opinion."

Professor White's critical interpretation of Shelley's life and

character and of their relation to his work is balanced, free from dogmatism, often original, and, to this reviewer at least, definitely convincing. A good illustration is what Mr. White himself recognizes as a risky "excursion into subjective interpretations," the explanation of the estrangement between Shelley and his wife after the death of their little girl, of the meaning of *Julian and Maddalo* and the other "sad poems" of those months, and of the bearing of that psychological situation upon the subsequent adoption by Shelley of his "Neapolitan daughter." The explanation is very complex, too complex for restatement here, and Mr. White is very cautious (a manuscript of Mary's in the Bodleian, had he seen it, might have increased his confidence); but there seems little doubt that he is right. Friends of Mary Shelley will be grateful for the fairness of Mr. White's treatment of her throughout the book; Shelley's relations with her and with other women are interpreted justly, sanely, credibly. If to some admirers of Shelley there is too much emphasis on his capacity for invention and self-delusion, it must be admitted that Mr. White offers a logical explanation not only for Shelley's stories about himself but for the development of his conscious philosophy of reality and unreality.

Professor White has recognized the importance of integrating literary criticism with biography. Even Chapter XXII, "Annus Mirabilis," which he says "may be safely ignored by those who seek in biography only 'material' facts," is no interruption of the story of Shelley's life. In itself a just and full appreciation of the work of 1819, it is also a necessary part of a book which evaluates critically the development in Shelley's writing of his thought and of his art and shows the essential unity of his prose, his poetry, and his life.

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

Goucher College

The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study. By GEORGE IAN DUTHIE. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1941. Pp. xii + 280. \$2.25.

This valuable monograph is number VI in the Shakespeare Problems series edited by Messrs. A. W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson. It begins with a clear and systematic review of the Bad-quarto theory in general. These fifty-four pages probably constitute the best summary to which graduate students can be directed for their introduction to the problems of classification, stenography, and memorial reconstruction, and to the contributions of Messrs. Pollard, Greg, McKerrow, Alexander, and Rhodes. Every instructor who prescribes it will attach his own string of reservation to the persons of those he orders into the labyrinth. Mine would be chiefly a con-

siderable scepticism concerning the likelihood of *A Shrew's* being a Bad quarto, at any rate of *The Shrew* (at this point Dr. Duthie himself leaves the subject open), and of the *Sir Thomas Moore* D hand's being Shakespeare's. The Introduction is followed by three short chapters summarizing the external evidence for a pre-Shakespearean *Hamlet* and for the alleged Shakespearean first draft, and stating the three main hypotheses for the origin of Q 1. I (1) that it represents an original play by Shakespeare, I (2) that it represents Shakespeare's first and partial revision of a pre-Shakespearean play, and II that it was derived from Q 2.

It is in his fourth chapter, as Dr. Greg notes in a foreword, that Mr. Duthie probably makes his most important contribution. He has analyzed those passages of metrically regular blank verse which are peculiar to Q 1, which, that is, while embodying more or less the same substance as Q 2 or F 1, are plainly not derived from either in vocabulary or style. He rejects the hypotheses that such lines are survivals from an *Ur-Hamlet* or early efforts by Shakespeare; and he demolishes the theory of his teacher, Professor Wilson, that these passages stood, at some stage of the play's textual history, in an authentic manuscript. Mr. Duthie denies that any such manuscript underlies the text of Q 1. The passages in question are "pirate-work pure and simple," since many of them are full of evidence of memorial reconstruction. The analysis is not concerned with stylistic criteria, judgments having produced, as such judgments usually do, an amusingly varied range of conclusions which effectively cancel each other out. Mr. Duthie demonstrates that

many passages consist simply of numerous stray fragments of text gathered together from various points scattered throughout the full Shakespearean versions, and even occasionally from other plays. These fragments are welded into presentably metrical, though generally dull and flat, blank verse. The person responsible has used his own powers of ingenuity and inventiveness in fitting the fragments together and in connecting them with short pieces of original matter.

To be sure, not every passage peculiar to Q 1 is referable to this method of composition. But if the reporter (or an assisting hack poet) was capable of this sort of fitting, fusing, and piecing out, his modest talents would not be unequal to the far from exacting requirements of the apparently original passages. Such as they are, there is no necessity for attributing them to Kyd or whoever it was that wrote the *Ur-Hamlet*. That this conclusion reinforces the theory of memorial reconstruction from the play represented by Q 2 and F 1 is obvious.

Moreover, as Mr. Duthie contends in Chapter V, "The 'Marcellus Theory,'" since the passages peculiar to Q 1 occur more frequently toward the end of the play, "the fact which we have to face is a gradual deterioration in the accuracy with which Q 1 represents the full text, a deterioration to be referred to the process of transmission rather than to conditions in the play underlying the

bad Quarto itself."¹ Mr. Granville-Barker has argued that in the last third of the play the "practical" pirate, unlike the generous Shakespeare, becomes alarmed about whether he can hold the audience's interest. Hence the "extra contraction" in that part of the play; and, Mr. Duthie adds, memory itself may have flagged. As for Marcellus, that problem merges, in Chapter VI, "The Composite Nature of the Copy for Q 1," with an elaborate theory, in the Wilsonian manner, of revision upon revision: according to Mr. Duthie, the transmission was the work of a reporter who "may very well have been" both actor-reporter and reporter-versifier, and of an interpolator; for "there are insertions," which may have been made by a second hand or by the reporter himself, "correcting and amplifying his own handiwork." This terminology has a familiar ring; many will be suspicious of it and of the allegedly specialized operations of the actor-reporter—reporter-versifier—versifier-interpolator, who turns out in a postscript to this chapter, composed after the author had seen Dr. Greg's sceptical comment, to be built along the lines of Mrs. Malaprop's Cerberus—three gentlemen at once! We should always bear in mind, whenever theories of revision are proposed, that the art of original composition is largely the art of revision. And an Elizabethan actor of any experience could probably spout extemporized blank verse by the hour, let alone write in a few fillers where memory failed. Not that Mr. Duthie is unmindful of the limitations and dangers of his method.

The remaining chapters are devoted to an attempt to get at the particular stage of textual history underlying Q 1, to a discussion of the as yet insoluble problems of *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, and to a summary of the author's views on Q 1. His final conclusion is essentially that "practically everything in it" was reconstructed from "the full Shakespearian text" of Q 2 or a stage version of Q 2, by an actor who had played Marcellus and perhaps other roles and who was equal to composing original blank verse when he was stumped. His only manuscript source (here Mr. Duthie accepts Mr. Wilson's contention) was the part of Voltemar. His work was revised and amplified, either by himself or someone else. Now and again, "deliberately or involuntarily," the reporter drew on the *Ur-Hamlet*; but this debt is "infinitesimal" compared with the debt to the full Shakespearian play represented by Q 2. Thus Q 1 does not represent the play that had been acted; it is a "conglomeration of elements from quite distinct versions," and Q 1 and *Brudermord* are alike in that they are Bad texts of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. That numerous questions remain unanswered and very likely unanswerable, Mr. Duthie is as ready as anyone to recognize. That he has carried the study of Q 1 a good step forward seems clear.

HAZELTON SPENCER

¹ This observation strikes me as a valuable enunciation of a sound general principle, frequently lost sight of in the New Shakespeare.

William Congreve the Man: a Biography from New Sources. By JOHN C. HODGES. The Modern Language Association of America, General Series, no. XI. New York: Modern Language Association, London: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. xxiii + 154.

Professor Hodges's index to his manuscript sources contains exactly one hundred items, from the redoubtable Sarah's *An Account of the Dutches of Marl. & montagus behaviour before & after their fathers death* through *Buttery Book Junior*, accounts of the commissioners for Hackney Coaches, the same for Hawkers and Pedlers, and "License for Betterton," to "Wines, Miscellaneous papers relating to the licensing of" and "Declared accounts of the Commissioners for." Many were not examined by earlier biographers. Mr. Hodges has been able to identify the dramatist's mother; to ascertain the precise date of his birth (in England, not Ireland); to distinguish between his papers and those which, however prized by collectors, are not his but his cousin's (one of four other and contemporary William Congreves); to reconstruct the surroundings of his boyhood, his schooling at that most polite of Irish towns, Kilkenny, and his three college years at Trinity, Dublin; and to add details of his life in London lodgings, among the Kit-Cats, and as a minor official. Eight "new" letters are printed and four "new" portraits are reproduced. "Many errors of long standing" have been corrected.

Throughout his book the author addresses himself to the correction of what he evidently regards as the most serious error of all. Those, says Mr. Hodges, who knew his subject best never charged him with vanity or insincerity. He certainly had a winning way with him; and the esteem of men like Dryden, Swift, and Pope is, as his latest biographer suggests, more to the point than the snap judgment of "a passing foreigner," even though that wayfarer was Voltaire. On the whole, Mr. Hodges's conclusions seem reasonable; yet this biography is so frankly a piece of special pleading that some doubts are bound to arise. Had the man no faults at all? The portrait may be a faithful likeness, but one's confidence is a little shaken by the spirit of hero worship in which it appears to have been composed.

Congreve's premature withdrawal from the stage had, Mr. Hodges assures us, nothing to do with the rebuke administered by Jeremy Collier. Nor was it due to ill health. The ease afforded by official sinecures and the consequent decay of ambition were not the cause: Congreve's income from the government was inconsiderable till toward the close of his life. He withdrew, we are told, because he valued his integrity as an artist above a popular success, and the reception of *The Way of the World* taught him that tastes had changed. It may be so—that seems to have been Congreve's own

explanation. But the decision, reached at thirty, meant the waste of a great talent. Better artists than Congreve have managed to adapt themselves to a changing world and gone on producing masterpieces. If a man who was born in 1670 found it impossible to make the necessary adjustments to the eighteenth century, so much the worse for him—unless, of course, adjustment would have meant falling to the level of a Rowe or an Addison. The sad thing about it is that he left the true comedy of manners in the hands of people like Burnaby; one would have thought Congreve big enough to perceive the limitations of the dazzling performances of his twenties, and to deepen his art without losing its brilliance. The truth is, his depth is somewhat uncertain; even his Whiggery, though Mr. Hodges seems to think this a virtue, was lukewarm, at any rate in formal expression. Perhaps he was only clever; perhaps a bad stomach sapped his vitality; perhaps he lacked the requisite degree of intestinal solidarity to withstand the blow of his most scintillating comedy's failure. At any rate, it looks as though he went down for the count rather easily. These suggestions may all be utterly erroneous, but one would like to see such questions seriously discussed in any work aiming to rehabilitate *the man*.

On the notorious will Mr. Hodges appears to make out a pretty clear case. This document, which has troubled many, was in all probability executed in simple justice and with extraordinary tact. In 1703 the third earl of Scarsdale bequeathed a thousand pounds to Anne Bracegirdle and expressed a desire "that this Legacy may be the first Money paid." Congreve was then thirty-three, he had twenty-six years to live. In the end, his love for Henrietta, second duchess of Marlborough, evidently returned by her with unreserved devotion, "completely filled his life." Her daughter Mary was born in 1723, nearly twenty years after the last of her older children, by her husband, Francis, Earl of Godolphin. Her mother, the great Duchess Sarah, "is said to have referred to Henrietta regularly as 'Congreve's Moll.'" The dramatist's will was drawn two years after Mary's birth. Since it contained "provisions through which the young girl was destined to inherit his estate," Mr. Hodges concludes that both her parentage and Congreve's correctness are obvious.

The phrase 'destined to inherit' is used advisedly, for Congreve did not will his property directly to Mary. To do so would have stirred up infinitely more gossip than was already in the air. The end desired could be attained, and much more discreetly, by another method. He could leave his property to the Duchess with the understanding that she would pass it along to the one in whom he was so deeply and so naturally interested.

That is what she did; and the crowning stroke of Congreve's part in the transaction was the naming of Godolphin as his sole executor. As for the Congreves, whom Dr. Johnson nominated as more appropriate beneficiaries than the wealthy Duchess, they were not in need. Neither was "Bracey," though Edward Young thought she

should have been remembered more handsomely. Considering everything, including the march of time, the bequest to her of two hundred pounds seems a really graceful action. It was a box of roses, not a meal ticket.

Whether or not the creator of *Mirabell* and *Millamant*—or, more accurately, the vocal spirit that speaks through and wonderfully animates those rather thin paper dolls—always conducted himself gracefully is not, after all, one of the gravest problems of historical scholarship. Yet, whatever the relative unimportance of literary biography, there can be no question of its perennial interest. To wonder what porridge had John Keats may be foolish, and when it leads men to forget to read the odes it is damnable; but the fact is, everybody wonders—especially those who love the odes. And so, while *Love for Love* and *The Way of the World* are of infinitely more concern to us than their composer's physical or moral constitution, this sober report on the man will be welcomed, with its nine attractive illustrations, besides the endpaper map of Congreve's London and its key to his haunts there. To my mind, a book on Congreve, of all people, could do with a bit more of sparkle; but that is a consideration of no importance compared with the fact that this biographer has gone to a great deal of trouble to get hold of the evidence. If a scholar's main business is to know (and if that is not his main business, what is?), Mr. Hodges has done right by Congreve at last. And that, in view of how much has been written about him that is wrong, is a substantial achievement.

HAZELTON SPENCER

Our Seneca. By CLARENCE W. MENDELL. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 285. \$3.00.

Mendell is Professor of Latin at Yale. His fellow classicists have learned to expect from him the penetration, thoroughness, and good taste which characterize this book. It is to be hoped that not only classicists but also those who are interested in Seneca for his influence on French and English literature will give careful attention to this offering. Those who approach Seneca from the modern side are likely to wonder how this work is to be regarded in comparison with F. L. Lucas' *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy*. Mendell's treatment of the modern authors is summary, and rather forms a useful conclusion to his treatment of Seneca than competes with Lucas' treatment of the moderns. The reviewer has no doubts, however, about expressing the hope that as a guide to Seneca himself for scholars in the modern fields Mendell's work will completely supplant Lucas'. Mendell far surpasses Lucas in knowledge of the

Greek and Latin dramatists and their *milieu* as well as in judiciousness and elegance of treatment.

The book opens with a comparison of the *Oedipus* of Sophocles and the *Oedipus* of Seneca which brings out clearly the great difference between the two plays and is useful as a means of throwing Seneca's general methods into high relief. After a long chapter on background comes a series of chapters on prologues, dramatic technique, long speeches, shorter speeches and dialogues, chorus, superhuman element, philosophic content, and stock characters. There is keen analysis of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides as well as of Seneca. The concluding chapter summarizes very briefly Seneca's influence on English tragedy. Translations by the author of the two plays discussed in the first chapter form an appendix.

Unfortunately a certain amount of the traditional elements of Senecan criticism appears in the book. Something might be gained, for instance, by the adoption of a convention that in discussions of Seneca's tragedies the words "rhetoric" and "rhetorical" would not be used. There are too many passages in the criticism of Seneca where it is plain that the necessity of using a paraphrase for these words would have forced the critic to say more exactly what he meant. See in this work pp. 78, 81, 93, 112, 188, and the more exact use on p. 196.

That Seneca's style was largely determined by the fact that his little public had "jaded nerves" is a highly dubious proposition. To say that the audience could not appreciate dialogue (p. 123) is to leave untouched the positive discussion of an important feature of Seneca's method. On pp. 94-95 we find a discussion of what Aeschylus achieved with a limited amount of dialogue; his *Agamemnon* is a splendid example.

At the end is another more or less traditional proposition, evidently designed to leave a final impression on the reader (p. 200). Perhaps Mendell is too severe on both Seneca and the early English dramatists at this point. He calls Seneca's tragedy an evaporated product (what can "evaporated" mean in this context?) which "gave to the predecessors of Shakespeare as much as they could absorb of a far greater drama than either he or they could comprehend." Possibly this is a trace of the attitude so prevalent a few decades ago that all Latin literature is a clumsy imitation of half-understood Greek works.

The chief weakness of this book, as of most studies of Seneca's tragedies, is on the side of positive criticism. For example, on pp. 84-88 there is a discussion of faults in technique in the *Troades* which adds up to a rousing damnation of the play. One who knew only this discussion might conclude that reading the play would be an intolerably dreary task, although the play invariably gives pleasure to its readers. Mendell remarks that it is obvious from the technique that the *Troades* was meant to be recited, not acted. At

that point we look for discussion of its effectiveness as a play for recitation, but instead we are left with the dismembered fragments on our hands to fit together as best we can, like Theseus at the end of the *Hippolytus*.

The chapter on the superhuman element is excellent as far as it goes, but has this same weakness. Mendell remarks (pp. 141-142) that Juno is the only goddess who appears in the plays and that she has become an angry woman, and that "the gods were not very useful to Seneca, who has but this one prologue divinity and no deus ex machina." A more positive criticism might remark that it is no accident that there are no divinities in Seneca. Seneca rewrote Euripides' *Hercules* carefully and consistently in order to eliminate all the supernatural influence except that of Juno in the prologue. She was a part of the story as established by Euripides, she was a useful protatic character, and she gave him an opportunity to study a character who was on the eve of committing a horrible deed, a favorite theme with him. He had these good reasons for not eliminating her, but he did remove her from the strictly dramatic part of the play, which unfolds itself on the human level without divine interference. In *Hippolytus* the goddesses who so obviously are symbols in Euripides are removed. The love of Phaedra for her stepson is readily comprehensible and dramatically sufficient without any symbolic goddess to motivate it, but Seneca, to replace the symbolic goddess of chilly virginity, built up subtly the characterization of Hippolytus as a late adolescent who has not yet outgrown that lack of interest and boyish uncertainty toward women which so often masquerades as aversion to women.

The refutation of the assertion that there is practically no characterization in Seneca's tragedies is a task which requires ample space and one which the reviewer hopes soon to undertake. If Mendell agrees with Leo that Seneca does not offer real characterizations, he is justified in not arguing the proposition, for argument (or demonstration) is properly the task of the other side. Yet it may be said that he is slightly unfair to the reader who has not pondered Seneca's tragedies and does not know the work of classical scholars, since Leo's proposition fails to convince many.

Yet the book is the best treatment of Seneca's tragedies now available and is heartily recommended.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

The Johns Hopkins University

The Printed Writings of Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, a Bibliography. By THOMAS H. JOHNSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 136. \$7.50.

This excellently detailed bibliography of Jonathan Edwards' published writings confirms the tradition of his fame at most points

and corrects it at others. According to Mr. Johnson's count, there have been 356 separate imprints of Jonathan Edwards' 60 titles since 1731, the year of his first published sermon. The fact that 24 of these 60 titles had been issued before 1758, the year of his death, suggests a fairly substantial reputation while he lived, particularly since first publication was customarily by subscription. Issues subsequent to 1758, both in number and distribution, attest the steady increase and widening of his posthumous fame. From 1765, the year in which Samuel Hopkins' sketch of his *Life and Character* first appeared, until 1806, when the first edition of his collected *Works* began to be issued, more than a hundred editions of his various titles appeared separately, and since 1806 they have continued to appear in every decade but one down to the present time.

If closely studied, however, this long list of editions sets certain limits to his continuing fame. Until 1758 only two of his pieces had been published outside of Boston: *True Grace* (1753) in New York and *Remarks on the Essays* (1758) in Edinburgh. His contemporary authority had been restricted for the most part to one field of interest; namely, revivals and revival behaviors. While he lived, his *Faithful Narrative* (1737) held the record for frequency of publication. Bibliographical data for his three later titles most frequently reprinted: *Religious Affections* (1746), *Life of David Brainerd* (1749), and *History of the Work of Redemption* (1774) chart the gradual extension of his authority to other areas of religious interest. The full history of religion in America cannot be written until complete bibliographical evidence is also available for other spokesmen of these same interests; for example, of the long battle between orthodoxy and "Arminianism," the growth of missionary zeal and humanitarian feeling, with the consequent shifts in theological emphasis which these changes required.

As for Jonathan Edwards himself, one might wish for as thorough a listing of the whole panorama of critical comment which his thought and practices have elicited, but such has been no part of Mr. Johnson's purpose. He has kept strictly to the limits set by Mr. James Thayer Gerould, to whom the inception of the present work is due. Within these limits his work is not only thoroughly informed and scrupulously accurate, but also richly suggestive. Students of the period who are not bibliographers will find in his descriptive comment frequent evidence of the scholar's feeling for implications.

OLA ELIZABETH WINSLOW

Goucher College

Correspondence of ROBERT BRIDGES and HENRY BRADLEY, 1900-1923. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. vi + 191. \$2.75.

To the specialist in prosody or in English phonetics these letters will provide theory and discussion beyond summary in a brief review. They open the workshop of the late Poet Laureate during his hours of investigation and his hours of leisure. We may see the assemblage of metric parts, including expert adaptations from quantitative rhythms, which were first put to use in the poems in Classical prosody and then developed through the *New Verse* to the "loose Alexandrines" of the *Testament of Beauty*. Bradley's questions and comments are as lively as the material under consideration.

To the general reader the correspondence has an equal interest. Many of the *obiter dicta* are charged with humour and shrewdness and surprise. For example: "Skeat revises his text according to his own notions of Chaucer's theory. . . . Skeat does not understand Chaucer's prosody. . . . I think Skeat is an ass. . . . If I were to spend an hour a day with you reading Chaucer and the pre-Chaucerian verse together, *we could solve all the doubtful points in about a fortnight*" (Bridges). There is more to this renunciation of Skeat's method than meets the eye. An examination of Bridges's theories will show that the core of his prosodic faith was based on the relation between natural sound and recurrence. It is closely linked to Hopkins's statement: "Take breath and read it with the ears, as I always wish it to be read, and my verse becomes all right." There is some lightness, but serious belief as well, when Bridges writes to Bradley: "This is a wonderful place for a variety of noises. I have told my children to make a full list of them, & then I will see how they scan. It is wonderful how things do scan with a little handling. I made several lists of various kinds in my Hexameter epistle."

As the correspondence between these two great gentlemen continued, the personal tone tended to displace the scholarly, and learned studies became richer with the partisanship and informalities of friendship. There is a fine reticence and warm intimacy almost Chinese in tone: the emphasis on the familiar, even the trivial, grew stronger as the first World War raged to the very thresholds of the writers. "I am delighted that you will come . . . about time, I do not yet know whether my boy will get away from his corps" (Bridges). "The spiritual fall of Germany has not been sudden: what was sudden was the open defection which is but the revealing symptom of a disease that is confined to no one land. . . . I am assured that the 'still small voice' is speaking in Germany, tho we can hear only the whirlwind" (Bradley). A few passages like these indicate the historical period; for the rest,

human lives and human art timelessly abide. The Preface to the correspondence sums it up well: "The letters record the friendship and the common interests of two men of genius, not more impressive by their intellectual versatility than by their purity of heart."

Harvard University

ROBERT HILLYER

Letters of Joseph Conrad to Marguerite Poradowska 1890-1920.

Translated from the French and Edited with an Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by JOHN A. GEE and PAUL J. STURM. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 147. \$2.75.

Dr. Gee and Dr. Sturm have made a contribution to the study of Conrad which is invaluable. The correspondence edited by them includes ninety-two letters that Conrad wrote between February, 1890, and June, 1895, and in the other half dozen or so collections of Conrad's correspondence there are only twenty-eight different letters written before 1895. The Poradowska correspondence, which also contains eighteen letters belonging between 1900 and 1920, provides new and important information as to Conrad's actions, thoughts, and feelings during his last years at sea and his first years as a writer.

Conrad gave Mme. Poradowska his vivid impressions of the Congo and of the Belgian colonizers there, which cast further light on "Heart of Darkness." He described his unsuccessful struggle to regain his health after his breakdown in Africa and his vain efforts to continue his career at sea. He wrote her in detail about the progress and difficulties of *Almayer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands*. He commented generally on letters and life. In these early years he corresponded with his sympathetic kinswoman as intimately as he later did with Garnett and Curle. The letters to Mme. Poradowska, moreover, have a suggestion of romantic gallantry found nowhere else. He confided in her his feeling of isolation, the depths of his depression, and his stoical philosophy of life. Though Conrad was not a writer of great letters, this collection contains some of his best.

Too much praise cannot be given the care and thoroughness with which the letters have been edited. It might be helpful to students to have all instead of specimens of the French originals; yet the translations have been made most accurate and readable. Every effort has been expended to explain troublesome allusions to family and literary matters. If the letters had not been edited before the invasion of Poland, much of their material might have remained

forever obscure. The correspondence has been placed in sequence, with full explanations, when necessary, of the order. The notes have been put on the page with the text, where they are most convenient. The editors have given the volume an excellent introduction, which relates Conrad to Mme. Poradowska and the correspondence to the events of both their lives. The letters could not have appeared under better auspices.

JOHN D. GORDON

New York Public Library

L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. Par AL. CIORANESCU. Paris: Editions des Presses Modernes, 1939. 2 vol. Pp. 399 et 338. 120 fr.

L'Arioste, un des auteurs italiens qu'on a le plus goûtés de tout temps en France, trouve en M. Cioranescu le dernier et le plus complet des historiens de sa fortune dans la patrie de son héros. D'importants travaux préparatoires avaient précédé l'étude d'ensemble du jeune érudit roumain, et, en reprenant le sujet, il rend hommage aux auteurs qui avaient défriché le terrain, Vianey, Toldo, Roth, Keyser, Alice Cameron, J. Lavaud, Chamard et autres. L'Arioste fut vite connu en France, sa vogue y fut grande et de longue durée. M. Cioranescu en trace la courbe à l'aide de nombreux textes cités et étudie avec soin l'influence littéraire du poète italien. Celle-ci est considérable et se remarque dans tous les genres; mais, sauf quelques notables exceptions, elle reste assez fragmentaire. Toujours vivement admiré pour ses réelles qualités de poète, l'Arioste était trop romanesque pour offrir une nourriture substantielle aux siècles classiques, et trop plaisant pour séduire les générations romantiques.

Aucun écrivain n'a su lui demander à la fois tout ce qu'il possédait, sa grâce, sa naïveté, la richesse de ses couleurs, sa tendresse, son ironie, son art des nuances et son talent de conteur. Mais, à notre sens, conclut M. Cioranescu, c'est justement là que réside l'intérêt du sujet: voir comment une littérature toute entière s'accommode d'un modèle qui n'est pas fait pour elle, dont elle reconnaît les mérites et les beautés, mais qu'elle ne réussit pas à mettre d'accord avec ses conceptions, et à faire entrer dans ses habitudes.

M. Cioranescu nous donne ici un livre bien nourri, consciencieusement documenté et agréablement écrit. Tout ce qu'il prend à ses devanciers il le réexamine avec attention pour arriver à des conclusions personnelles et souvent nouvelles. La discussion d'une attribution, d'une source ou d'une date l'entraîne parfois dans des longueurs qui risquent de fatiguer, et en voulant situer les hommes et les œuvres qu'il étudie dans les courants et les mouvements, il n'a pas toujours évité les répétitions; mais ces légers inconvénients

n'enlèvent rien à l'utilité de l'ouvrage. Quoique l'histoire proprement dite de la fortune de l'Arioste en France ne s'étende guère au-delà du dix-huitième siècle, la liste des traductions et des imitations et celle des études françaises sur le poète, placées à la fin du second volume, se continuent jusqu'à nos jours. D'intéressantes *Annexes*, reproduisant des imitations et une critique rimée inédites, une bibliographie volumineuse et un index de vingt-huit pages, complètent ces deux beaux volumes qui forment une contribution importante à l'histoire de l'italianisme en France.¹

CHANDLER B. BEALL

The University of Oregon

Italian Nationalism and English Letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian men of letters. By HARRY RUDMAN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. 440. \$3.25. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 146.)

In the nineteenth century Englishmen, probably most Englishmen, who thought of Italy or visited it, continued to regard it practically as a resort or poetically as "the land of the dead." But many, including some of England's best writers, saw that Italy was becoming something more, were moved by what they believed to be the "resurrection" of a great nation, and recorded their reflections and feelings in prose and verse. This phenomenon is so interesting for the light it throws on English life and letters that it has been the subject of various studies. Mr. Rudman's contains the most complete account yet given of the literature in English on which such studies can be based.

Mr. Rudman has pushed his investigation beyond the bounds of literature to include all references to the Risorgimento that he can find, even in translations into English. This research is Mr. Rudman's most important contribution. Every interested scholar will

¹ Quelques négligences que j'ai notées en passant: I, 31 et ailleurs, lire *La Boderie* pour *La Borderie*. I, 357, n. 7, le *Renaud amoureux* de La Ronce (1620) n'est pas un roman tiré de l'épisode d'Armide et Renaud de la *Jérusalem délivrée*, mais une adaptation du *Rinaldo*, poème juvénile du Tasse. I, 369, Jacques Corbin ne traduit pas le Tasse, mais l'imita dans un roman; erreur due au *Manuel* de Lanson II, 52 n., lire Roth pour Keyser, donné comme auteur de *Der Einfluss von Ariost's Or. fur.* II, 109, n. 21, l'anecdote des deux sénateurs qui se battent en duel au sujet du Tasse et de l'Arioste est rapportée par Grimm, non au volume IV de sa *Corr. litt.* (éd. Tourneux), mais au volume VI, 40. II, 125, n. 76, Madame Du Deffand écrit à Voltaire qu'elle préfère l'Arioste au Tasse, non le contraire; le Tasse lui paraît d'une "beauté plus languissante que touchante, plus gourmée que majestueuse, et puis je hais les diables à la mort."

feel sincerely grateful for the mass of references contained in the notes and in sections II-X of the ample Bibliography.

The author has tried to manage his findings by marshalling them in chronological order in sections devoted to the men and events that excited the greatest interest in England. The chronological treatment has increased the difficulties of the undertaking for Mr. Rudman and his readers. The book purports to be "a cross-section of British and Italian intellectual relationships," but when, under each broad topic, the sectioning takes the form of annual slices, the veining or design in these relationships, if any exists, is hard to find. Mr. Rudman himself speaks of "the kaleidoscope of the attitudes which the English took towards the Risorgimento." The attitudes were, no doubt, kaleidoscopic; but the confusion is worse confounded because Mr. Rudman, proceeding year by year, never feels it necessary to make up his mind from what points of view he can write up his material as a whole with the best results. He is prone to use each bit of it for a different purpose—to give an Italian exile's views of English literature; to retouch the portrait of Mazzini or Garibaldi; to reflect literary opinion or "public" opinion; to show how exiles fared in England; to illustrate Gladstone's or Disraeli's attitudes; to point a moral for our time; to exhibit Swinburne's deliriums; even to "document" events in Italy. The result is bewildering; and Mr. Rudman is beguiled, besides, into many an unwary and unnecessary misstep, particularly in regard to Italian characters and events. No broad traits emerge, least clearly of all the characteristics of English life and letters illustrated by the excitement over Italy.

To the extent to which these faults result from the ambition to use every scrap of new evidence our system of producing dissertations and not Mr. Rudman should be blamed. On the publisher will descend the wrath of the reader for having been forced to plunge and zigzag to the back of the book for the notes, to which he must refer at every step to make a profitable use of this kind of text.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD

The Johns Hopkins University

The Connections of the Geste des Loherains with Other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres. By RUSSELL KEITH BOWMAN. New York, 1940. Pp. xv+168.

Mr. Bowman has shown that the five poems of the Loherain cycle—*Hervis de Mes*, *Garin le Loherain*, *Girbert de Mes*, *Yon*, and *Anseïs de Mes*—do not occupy the almost completely isolated posi-

tion which has sometimes been ascribed to them, but that they contain themes derived from earlier literary works and have, in turn, supplied themes for later ones. The author's treatment, however, illustrates the dangers inherent in any examination of sources and influence undertaken before the texts in question have been submitted to critical scrutiny. In the Loherain cycle, as in quantities of Old French poems, successive revisers and interpolators have added much that is altogether without significance for a general survey. Satisfactory texts are lacking for *Garin, Gurbert*, and *Anseys*, and individual manuscripts are frequently incapable of giving a trustworthy picture. Mr. Bowman has exercised too little discrimination in seizing whatever evidence he could collect from all redactions to which he had access. Consequently, in spite of the cases where he has brought together conclusively parallel passages, his general summary is valid only for a chaotic corpus which may never have existed, and the problem of sources will need to be restudied after critical editions of the individual texts have appeared.

It is distressingly evident that Mr. Bowman has not received the training necessary for the scientific investigation of such a complex problem, for the scholarly control of his materials, or for the accurate statement of the points he makes. His findings are presented in three ways: the Introduction gives (p. x) a tripartite division into "external," "internal," and "coincidental" connections; the body of the work discusses the individual poems in genealogical order, with little reference to the divisions established in the Introduction; the concluding chapter reorganizes the material (p. 138) into a seven-fold classification which is the best of the three, and whose use throughout would have enhanced the value of the work. Insufficient familiarity with Old French has led to the printing (p. 68) as *-ié* the rhymes of a stanza consisting of feminine adjectives and participles in *-ie* (= *-iee*). Paul Meyer is credited (p. 104, note 8) with the authorship of the Old French translation of the *Vita Girardi* which he published in *Rom.*, VII (1878), pp. 179-225. It is often clear that statements found in handbooks of literature or in other secondary sources have been accepted as authority without the effort of first-hand control. Stylistic infelicities are not infrequent; in particular, the repeated use of "devious" (pp. 1, 37, 141) where the sense evidently demands "divers" is a blemish which should not have been allowed to find its way into print.

BATEMAN EDWARDS

Washington University

Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet. an Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey. By IRA O. WADE. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 241.

Mr. W. presents a discussion of the intellectual activity in which both Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet were engaged during the years 1733-49 and proves that the Cirey Period was in no sense an interlude in the development of Voltaire's thought and interests from the English Period to the sojourn in Berlin.

The book is divided into four chapters: 1. The intellectual atmosphere at Cirey—dealing essentially with the intellectual pre-occupations of Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet at Cirey, 2. The *Examen de la Genèse*—an analysis of the contents of seven hundred and thirty eight pages of manuscript material somewhat similar in kind to the clandestine treatises which Mr. W. had so well criticized and analyzed in a previous book, 3. The *Examen de la Genèse*: sources, author, date, in which Mr. W. attributes the manuscript to Mme du Châtelet, shows her indebtedness particularly to Dom Calmet and Thomas Woolston and places the composition of the voluminous commentary between the years 1736-49; 4. The *Examen de la Genèse* and Voltaire—a study of Voltaire's indebtedness in the *Sermon des Cinquante*, the *Examen important de Milord Bolingbroke*, the *Bible enfin expliquée*, to Mme du Châtelet's manuscript.

The drawback to the book is found in the rather involved argumentation the author uses to prove his points. In some instances the arguments presented are not convincing. In the case of Mme du Châtelet's "translation" of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, for instance, Mr. W. concludes that it must have been made before 1735 since the preface bears that date and "since in all likelihood the preface to the work would be the last portion written" (p. 25). Facts tend to disprove such reasoning as Mme du Châtelet admits as late as May 1737 that she is not well versed in English (p. 15). Besides, the earliest reference she makes to her translation dates from May 1736 in a letter to Algarotti. This reference is couched in significant terms: "Je m'exerce dans l'art de la traduction, pour m'en rendre digne. Je traduis *The fable of the bees* de Mandeville . . ." (E. Asse, p. 90).¹ The preface itself, with the exception

¹ In this connection a statement with regard to Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* and Voltaire's *Mondain* (p. 25) needs clarification in fairness to M. Morize. It reads: "Mr. Morize, having noted the parallel passages in the two works, was unwilling to treat Mandeville as a source for the *Mondain*, since there was no evidence of Voltaire's familiarity with the English moralist." M. Morize, on the contrary, devotes several pages to showing that Voltaire could not help but be familiar with Mandeville; cf. *Le Mondain et l'apologie du lucre au XVIII^e*, pp. 72-80. M. Morize concludes on p. 110: "Nous inclinons volontiers à croire qu'il y a dans cette page de Mandeville une source très prochaine des vers 59-110 du *Mondain*." Cf. also his notes to the *Défense du Mondain*, p. 161, et *passim*.

of the last four short paragraphs, which may have been added at the last moment, does not help to prove anything as it is a defense of the art of translating and of feminism.

Equally unconvincing are the arguments offered for attributing exclusively to Mme du Châtelet the *Examen de la Genèse*. The handwriting is neither Voltaire's nor Mme du Châtelet's. The study of the text Mr. W. admits "leads inevitably to the conclusion that either one or the other must have written it," and he adds that the "tone (of Voltaire), or rather tones, of mockery, gayety, quondam bitterness, have been reproduced at least in part in the *Examen*" (pp. 128 and 133). If such are the facts, how can collaboration possibly be excluded? The fact that the *Bible enfin expliquée* was published and the *Examen de la Genèse* was not does not help solve the question of authorship, particularly since Voltaire in the *Bible enfin expliquée*, the *Examen important de Milord Bolingbroke*, and the *Sermon des cinquante* seems to have extracted a great deal of the juice from the *Examen de la Genèse*. Could he not have extracted from the *Examen* what may have been his own contribution to it?

Similarly, in the last chapter, I get the impression that Mr. W. is anxious to crowd too much into the Cirey Period and to make his arguments fit the case. I should have been readily convinced about the earlier composition of the several works of Voltaire Mr. W. mentions, if he had been able to offer a history of the disposition of the manuscript of the *Examen de la Genèse* at Mme du Châtelet's death.

I have called attention to the weakness of the book. I am certain that its strong qualities more than compensate for it.

EMILE MALAKIS

CORONA. Studies in Philology in Celebration of the Eightieth Birthday of Samuel Singer. Edited by ARNO SCHIROKAUER and WOLFGANG PAULSEN. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1941. Pp. 282. \$4.00.

Many a *Festschrift* in honor of a revered teacher has been issued by his former students, so many in fact that doubts have been raised as to whether one more fine old custom is not getting to be a bit too routine to retain its pristine flavor. But in the case of this volume the striking title is immediately reassuring: it calls up a *Seminarkneipe*, a place where hard-working professors and students gather in friendship, where his old students—*die ganze Corona*—present to the old master the kind of scholarly tribute he is sure to appreciate. Another meaning of *corona* is cleverly brought into the picture by Dr. Schirokauer in his introduction when he remarks that the students of Dr. Singer, a scholar who limited himself to

cultivating but one small corner in the vast field of Germanics, from their various diverse specialties have woven a wreath to be presented to him on his eightieth birthday.

The offerings in the almost three hundred pages are so polyhistoric that probably few reviewers would venture to assay them critically, each in turn; at least the present writer has not the temerity. But I shall say that wherever I turned in the the book I found it stimulating, as a list of the articles may serve to illustrate:

Folklore: Archer Taylor, A Metaphor of the Human Body in Literature and Tradition; Alfred Senn, On the Sources of a Lithuanian Tale; Richard Jente, A Review of Proverb Literature Since 1920; Friedrich C Sell, Ein Lobspruch von eim schiessen zu Augsburg 1509 *Linguistics*: Anna Granville Hatcher, *Son Cors* in Old French, Robert H. Weidman, The Orthographic Conflation of Nominal Compounds in MHG based on a Study of the Manesse Manuscript; Leo Spitzer, Zwei französische Neologismen. *Middle Ages*: Arno Schirokauer, Der zweite Meiseburger Zauberspruch; Gustave von Grunebaum, On the Development of the Type of Scholar in Early Islam; Lawrence Ecker, Die Blumenbeschreibungen der spanisch-arabischen Hofdichter; Henry W. Nordmeyer, Hohe Minne bei Reinmar von Hagenau: MF 176, 5; Hans Sperber, Kaiser Ottos Ehre (Walther 26, 33). *Modern German Literature*: Thomas Mann, Goethes Werther; Ernst Feise, Clemens Brentanos Geschichte vom braven Kasperl und schönen Annerl; Gustav E Mueller, Solger's Aesthetics—A Key to Hegel (Irony and Dialectic), Wolfgang Paulsen, Adalbert Stifter und der *Nachsommer*, Ludwig W Kahn, Fortschrittsglaube und Kulturkritik im bürgerlichen Roman; Francine B. Bradley, Zwischen Naturalismus und Symbolismus. Eine Stilanalyse einiger Jugendgedichte René Schickeles.

In these days when the United States remains practically the only spot on the globe where Germanic studies can be carried on with detachment and objectivity¹ a great responsibility rests on Germanists to do this in a worthy manner. *Corona* is encouraging inasmuch as this book shows that we have in practically every branch of the subject thorough scholars on whom the mantle of the great men of the past evidently has fallen. It is a comfort to note also that we have a foundation of the type of the Oberlaender Trust to subsidize such scholarship and university presses of the character of Duke University to bring out such works in fine format and excellent printing.

A. E. ZUCKER

University of Maryland

¹ As one illuminating illustration the factual reporting by Dr. Jente (p. 30) may be cited. After discussing the superior work done in the past by Germans on proverb literature, he goes on in his bibliographical listing: "The well-known collection of Georg Buchmann, *Geflügelte Worte. Der Zitatenschatz des deutschen Volkes*, has been reissued several times during the past two decades. The last one to appear in the spirit of Buchmann is that edited by L. Heinemann (Berlin, 1929). A 'purified edition' was edited by V. Tornius (Leipzig, 1936), in which current sayings coined by non-Aryans are omitted from the body of the book but marked as such in the alphabetical list at the end with obvious intent. A large number of utterances of the present-day political leaders are included, not because they are household words but 'ought to become such.'"

BRIEF MENTION

The Divine Science: the Aesthetic of Some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets. By LEAH JONAS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 292. \$3.00. (Columbia University Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 151.) Critics did not flourish in the seventeenth century! Miss Jonas, therefore, has had to derive her study from what the poets themselves say of their art and its practice. In assembling a mass of widely-scattered source material from poems and from prefaces and notes by the poets, Miss Jonas has made an invaluable contribution. Her aim is to demonstrate the underlying likenesses in these poets, as a means to a truer interpretation than the previous stress on differences and its resulting division of the poets into the "schools" of Spenser, Jonson, and Donne. Her emphasis on the continuation of the Renaissance didactic theory of poetry and her classification of poets according to the scope and seriousness of their aim are also illuminating. Demonstrating that Scaliger's scale of poetry led to an established "hierarchy" of types in the seventeenth century, Miss Jonas shows how the poets who aimed at the highest type, the heroic poem, willingly subjected themselves to a long and severe period of training in such "low" types as the sonnet, pastoral, and satire. Her study of these poets forms the greater part of the book and is by far the most interesting and valuable contribution made.

Miss Jonas is less successful in her treatment of the field of religious verse. A study which deals with the Christian heroic poem should include the theory of the Christian Epic, which evolved in both France and England during the seventeenth century and resulted in the famous quarrel as to whether or not Christian machinery could be used in an epic. Furthermore, Miss Jonas does not adequately survey the causes of the rise of religious poetry in the century or the relation of this poetry to the Renaissance devotional literature and didactic theory of poetry. The treatment of short secular poems is exceedingly slight. This omission could be justified by reference to other studies, but some reason should be given for saying so little about these poems.

Finally, there are several minor points of criticism. Miss Jonas classifies the poets as "major" or "minor" according to the scope of their work. Such a classification makes Donne a "minor" poet! The didactic aim and the desire for immortality are points which are too greatly labored. And the limits of the period discussed are not clearly designated.

R. FLORENCE BRINKLEY

Goucher College

Letters from Elizabeth Barrett to B. R. Haydon. Edited by MARTHA HALE SHACKFORD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. lxxii + 78. \$2.00. From the great store of letters at Wellesley written by Elizabeth Barrett, Professor Shackford has taken those which the lady wrote to Benjamin Haydon between 1842 and 1845. They number eighteen, besides three fragments, and mainly consist of Miss Barrett's comments upon Haydon's pictures and the manuscript of his autobiography, encouragement for the neglected "genius" at the time when his fortunes were in decline, gossip upon the men and movements of the hour, and illustrations of the writer's literary interests. Through the letters we see Miss Barrett as she was in those years: an invalid in Wimpole Street, seeing few people beyond the circle of her family, but cheerful, healthy of mind if not of body, a voracious reader, and a writer of extraordinarily clear and charming letters. The letters are fully and excellently edited, and the only criticism one can reasonably make is that one has to turn to the back of the book for the notes instead of having them conveniently at the foot of the page or just preceding the letter.

Accompanying the text and the notes Professor Shackford has given an introduction of seventy pages, made up of sketches of Haydon and Miss Barrett. Here the editor sets the correspondence in the lives of each of the participants, and gives us besides clear and proportioned portraits of each of the principals. Though her understanding of Miss Barrett's nature and her position merits our praise, Professor Shackford is at her best in her account of the egotistic, mercurial, generous, and improvident painter. She recognizes and describes the strength in Haydon that won for him the "interest and sympathetic respect of Wordsworth, Keats, Lamb, Scott, Mrs. Siddons, Miss Mitford, Miss Barrett, Canova, Rumohr, Kirkup, and others." But she also recognizes his lack of capability in the kind of paintings he attempted, and the strength in him that was mere obstinacy and wrong headedness. It was this latter flaw in his character which, when his stubbornness was broken, led to his suicide. Professor Shackford's task, though not a great one, is thoroughly well done.

WILLIAM C. DE VANE

Yale University

Fifty Years of German Drama. A Bibliography of Modern German Drama, 1880-1930 based on the Loewenberg Collection in the Johns Hopkins University Library. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. Pp. ix + 111. \$3.75. The acquisition of the Loewenberg Collection by the Library of the Johns Hopkins University was an event of capital importance for students of modern German drama. The present catalogue is a most valuable record of

the many treasures contained in the Loewenberg Collection. But it is more than that. Anyone who turns its pages will find that they offer a graphic survey of the various currents in German literary life during the period they cover, as reflected by the drama. The collection, as Professor Ernst Feise points out in the foreword, includes plays by non-German writers of even second and third rank who influenced or were influenced by German productions. This should prove a rich mine of information for the student of comparative literature and literary influences in both directions.

One of the most important features of the catalogue is the inclusion of data concerning the premières of the plays it lists. This type of information is usually difficult to obtain without much painful digging; here it is given with nearly every entry. It is a pity that Dr. Loewenberg sacrificed the ideal of completeness to the bibliophile's dream of collecting first editions. As a result some plays by important playwrights like Gerhart Hauptmann, Wedekind, Fritz von Unruh, Werfel are omitted from the catalogue. In spite of this deficiency, however, *Fifty Years of German Drama* is a volume which every library and every scholar interested in the field it covers should possess.

H. STEINHAUER

University of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Some Studies in the Modern Novel. By DOROTHY M. HOARE. Litchfield, Connecticut: Prospect Press, 1940. Pp. vi + 154. \$2.00. These essays, first delivered as lectures at Cambridge, were published in England in 1939. One cannot help feeling that the demands of the original presentation compelled Miss Hoare to cover more material than was consistent with the delicate touch of her criticism. In most of the essays the author's contribution lies in a certain intuitive insight, as in the short note on Katherine Mansfield, or in the grasp of a certain special aspect of her subject, as in the treatment of Conrad's irony. Yet just as one is expecting her to elaborate some suggestion, her exposition suddenly spreads out into a general description of the author's work or an academic pronouncement on what "constitutes his claim to the possession of a distinctive attitude."

It is in the essay on Conrad that the reader is perhaps most provoked by such didactic irrelevancy. Following a suggestion of Dr. Richards, but not, it is to be feared, his warnings on semantic pitfalls, she approaches the problem of Conrad's romanticism. Her suggestion that in *Lord Jim* Conrad "gives a very subtle exposure of the problem of 'romanticism' and suggests its cure" is promis-

ing. Miss Hoare, however, at once plunges into a discussion of the "romanticism" of setting, the "pseudo-romanticism" of purple passages, and the novelist's concern with the "fundamental simplicity of response." When she does reach Conrad's "cure" she quotes from the scene with Stein ("The way is to the destructive element submit yourself") and Marlowe's concluding words. To this commentary she adds nothing. It is the reader's conviction that she was capable of adding a great deal that persuades him that Miss Hoare could have written a better book.

LOUIS TEETER

The Johns Hopkins University

Tamerlane and Other Poems. By A BOSTONIAN. Boston, 1827. Reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. lxxi + 40. (Facsimile Text Society.) Dr. Mabbott's facsimile edition of Poe's 1827 *Tamerlane* supplies two clear wants of students of American poetry: first, the need of an accurate facsimile in an adequate edition and at a reasonable price, and, second, a competent study of the literary history of this chief of rare Americana. *Tamerlane* has been several times reproduced, in type-facsimile or by photography, but always in limited editions which were quickly out of print. The original was for years so scarce that even Poe had no copy and none reached the hands of a librarian or a bibliophile until a decade after the author's death. Since that time a number of copies have emerged from obscurity, but *Tamerlane* still enjoys a fabulous rating among booksellers and collectors.

Precise information about its publication has been as scarce as the book itself. With *Tamerlane* Poe established a tradition which he followed in 1829 and in 1831; that is, when adrift and penniless to publish a book of verse. In Dr. Mabbott's introduction we get at last something more than legend about Calvin Thomas, who printed the first of these books, and an interesting attempt to lighten the darkness which has always enveloped Poe's movements in the interval of about two months between his leaving Mr. Allan's home and his enlistment in Boston. This darkness Poe heightened by what seems deliberate mystification, and biographers have been able to offer nothing but finespun conjecture. In the entry in Octavia Walton's album Dr. Mabbott has presented a bit of tangible evidence that Poe was in Baltimore May 1, 1827, evidence which though admittedly slight carries conviction. His sixty pages of introduction make this admirable reproduction of Poe's first book a valuable addition to every shelf of Poeana.

JOHN C. FRENCH

The Johns Hopkins University

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

APRIL, 1942

Number 4

JEAN CROSNIER

In his *History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*,¹ Professor Lancaster, with his extraordinary thoroughness, devotes several pages to Jean Crosnier and his comedy, *l'Ombre de son rival*, correcting the error which had identified that play with *Les Frayeurs de Crispin*, and pointing out the fact that the latter play is but a reduction into one act of the five act *Esprit Follet* of Le Metel d'Ouille. The confusion apparently goes back to a statement by P. Lacroix in the Catalogue de Soleinne, which was corrected in the *Errata* but followed by Monval in his *Laquais de Molière*, by Mongrédien in *Les Grands Comédiens du XVIIe Siècle*, and by others. It is true that the attention of these authors was directed to the actor du Perrier, whose identification as a former valet of Molière had been made possible by Crosnier's references to him.

My interest in Crosnier had been aroused some years ago by the attribution of *Les Frayeurs de Crispin* to Chappuzeau,² since its author is only designated as C. I am inclined to agree with Professor Lancaster that Chappuzeau was not guilty of this act of plagiarism, although the skill with which it was done appears beyond the ability of Crosnier and is not outside the ingenuity of Chappuzeau.

Although Crosnier's claim to the attention of the literary historian is very slight, there are some puzzles connected with him, and it may be worth while to suggest them, and give such information as is available, in the hope that some one more fortunate may stumble on the solutions.

It is tempting to try to link him with the Crosniers mentioned in the records of the Comédie française as "décorateurs" and

¹ Part IV, Vol. II, pp. 547 ff. (The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1940.)

² This attribution was made by Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes*, cited by G. Monval, *Le Laquais de Molière*, Paris, 1887. and by J. Caullery, *Bull. de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Prot.*, 1909, p. 155.

"gagistes." His acquaintance with du Perrier as the "laquais de Molière" would suggest this, but I have found nothing to substantiate it, nor any relationship with Jacques Crosnier, the actor known as Du Perche, who Monval suggests may have been "son frère cadet."³

There is a reference to an actor Jean Crosnier, cited by Lancaster, which occurs in Jal's *Dictionnaire* in the article on Lolli who signed the baptismal record of Crosnier's son at Paris in 1677.

On the other hand, our first definite record for our Jean Crosnier is his dedication of *L'Ombre de son rival*, published at The Hague in 1681. The following year he was editing the scandalous weekly chronicle in verse, *Le Mercure burlesque*, in Amsterdam, where he also published a novel, *L'Epouse fugitive*, to which he makes reference in the number of *Le Mercure burlesque* for May 13, 1682, in his attack on Du Perrier, director of the "Comédiens de Mgr. le Prince d'Orange."

The passage cited by Monval, Fransen, and others, is as follows:

Du Perrier que pour certain
L'on sçait être un fils de P . . .
Qui dans sa plus jeune carrière
Fut un des Lacquais de Molière
Et dont le métier et l'esprit
Est par le *Mercur*e décrit
Dans son *Epouse fugitive* . . .

The *Mercur*e continued to appear at least through the following year.

In 1685, Crosnier aided in the apprehension of a certain Chavigny de la Bretonnière, who had run away from St. Germain des Prés with 600 pistoles, and was publishing in Holland a weekly sheet, *Lardons*, in which he attacked various high dignitaries, and had composed also a libel on Mme de Maintenon and M. le Tellier, entitled *Le Cochon Mitré*.⁴ In the account of this episode given by François Ravaisson, in the *Archives de la Bastille*, Vol. VIII, from documents in the B. N. we find:

³ G. Monval, *Le Laquais de Molière*, Paris, 1887, note to p. 12.

⁴ In the *Mercur*e burlesque of June 4, 1682, Crosnier had referred to Chavigny:

"A Leyde Mercure Lundy
Trouva le Sr de Chavigny
Cet Auteur habille et célèbre . . ."

M. de Louvois menaçait Alvarès de le perdre s'il ne faisait prendre la Bretonnière; il retourna dans ce dessein à Amsterdam; il fit force débauches avec la Bretonnière, un nommé Chapusot la Chaise, natif d'Issoudun en Berry, qui a fort couru, qui avait apostasié à Genève, et s'y était marié depuis retourné en son pays, veuf, s'était remarié s'étant fait Catholique,⁵ et un nommé Crosnier, de Normandie, qui fait la *Gazette Burlesque*, en France, mais ayant enlevé une fille et tué un homme, il s'était sauvé à Amsterdam. Ces trois amis de la Bretonnière, apparemment de concert, l'engagèrent à sortir d'Amsterdam, non sans grande répugnance de sa part. . . . (He was captured in France, condemned and confined in a wooden cage at Mont St Michel until his death.)

Crosnier a eu grâce de son crime et permission de continuer la *Gazette Burlesque* pour avoir fait prendre la Bretonnière. It est de Rouen.

In 1687, Crosnier was himself in prison in France. Ravaissou⁶ gives several pages to the sordid affair. He was arrested and condemned to prison with two women, la Comtesse de Roissy and Dame de la Pallu, who were accused of practicing abortions. "Crosnier servait d'entremetteur et vendait des traités de sorcellerie." Under date of May 24, 1687, Seignelay writes to M. d'Autichamp, Commandant d'Angers, "Je vous envoie Crosnier pour être détenu toute la vie, et il faut le garder fort soigneusement." Professor Lancaster, to whom I owe this reference, sums up the account given in the *Archives de la Bastille*, the conflicting claims made by Crosnier as to nationality, religion and parentage, his escape from Angers in 1695, his subsequent imprisonment at Vincennes, his condemnation to the galleys in 1701 for having tried to murder M. de Bernaville, the warden of Vincennes, imprisonment in the Bastille, and again in Vincennes, where he died of dropsy, "la nuit du 27 au 28 (Octobre 1709) à minuit."

The matter is a little more complicated, however, for there are two dossiers concerning him in the *Mss. des Archives de la Bastille* (Nos. 10,438 and 10,526) at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. In one,

⁵ This Chapusot who had been a Protestant at Geneva, and been twice married, makes one wonder if the allusion is to Samuel Chappuzeau. The details do not suit exactly, and I have never seen *la Chaise* added to Chappuzeau's name, but he was touring Europe at this time, visiting Holland, where he had previously spent considerable time. According to his biographer Meinel, Chappuzeau was that same year composing a monthly journal in verse, entitled *Mercure*, for the Duke of Braunschwig-Lünebourg, at Celle, Germany, where he became "gouverneur des pages" at the court in 1682. This hints strongly at some connection between Crosnier and Chappuzeau.

⁶ François Ravaissou, *Archives de la Bastille*, Vol. IX, Paris, 1877, pp. 2-11.

dated 1687, he is implicated in the affair of Benjamin Crutz, or Cruytz, who was suspected of correspondence with a certain Fil-lincks or Jokran, accused of planning to murder the king.⁷ A letter from Crutz was found in the pocket of Crosnier. An inventory is given of the contents of the pockets and the valise of Crosnier. In the latter were found, among other books and documents, two bound volumes of the *Année Burlesque*, and a copper plate containing a portrait of Crosnier. (The edition for 1682 has his portrait as frontispiece.) There were also some scurrilous verses regarding the statues of the king and the duc de la Feuillade.

In 1701, when he was brought to trial for the attempted murder of M. de Bernaville, the original charge seems to have been forgotten.

A notation on the margin of one of these documents reads: "Gentilhomme allemand dont les ancêtres étaient français," and, the "Arrest d'Enregistrement de la d^{te} Commission du 27 7^{br} au d. an"; states:

Jean Crosnier, Gentilhomme des Environs de Hambourg en Allemagne, d'abord détenu à Vincennes et ensuite transféré à la Bastille pour l'instruction de ce son procès, le 21 8^{br} 1701. Sorti le 11 9^{bre} au d. an, après le Jugement qui a été rendu contre lui le 7 du d. mois de 9^{bre} par lequel le d Crosnier a été condamné aux galères perpétuelles,

Il y a apparence que sa 1^{re} détention à Vincennes étoit pour Cause d'Epigrammes Insolentes Contre le Roy et M. de la Feuillade touchant la position de la statue de sa Majesté à la place des Victoires.

(signed) M. Robert procureur Général de la Commission

(In margin) 19 8^{br} 1701

Gaudion, Greffier

Crosnier evidently made every effort to conceal his origin. His conflicting stories do not exclude the possibility that he was related to the Crosniers of Paris, but there were several families of this name, as the index of the Archives Nationales would show. He may have thought that foreign nationality would enable him to obtain banishment rather than prison. M. de Launay, commandant de Vincennes, wrote to Pontchartrain shortly before Crosnier's death, (September 29, 1709):

On ne peut prendre aucune confiance à tout ce que dit Crosnier, et particulièrement sur le lieu de sa naissance et de sa qualité; il m'a toujours dit qu'il était gentilhomme danois. J'ai entendu dire à M. de Bernaville que feu M. de la Reynie et Desgrez n'en ont jamais pu découvrir la vérité,

⁷ *Id.*, pp. 18-24.

non plus que la religion qu'il professait; il y a lieu de croire qu'il n'en avait aucune; je ne laisserai pas de m'en informer et de vous en rendre compte.*

More important than the identity of Crosnier is the question of the authorship of works attributed to him.

The only works about which there is no question are:

I *L'Ombre de son rival*, Comedie, meslee de Musique & de Dances, A La Haye, chez Gerard Rammazeyn, 1681, apparently reprinted in 1683, since the copy which I examined bears this date (Bib. Nat YF 7507). The dedication is signed Cronier. This play is fully summarized and discussed by Lancaster.⁹

II. *L'Epouse fugitive*, Histoire galante nouvelle & véritable par le sieur Crosnier, a Amsterdam 1682. In-12, without name of publisher. 225 pages of text. Dedication to Mademoiselle de Kernis signed Croimier. 2 copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale, y^s 12515 and 25251. Notable for the passage concerning du Perier, which has no bearing on the story and was evidently introduced only to discredit the actor.¹⁰

III. *Le Mercure burlesque*, a rhymed gazette, published at Amsterdam, the first number dated Jan. 1, 1682, collected as *l'Année burlesque*, ou Recueil des pieces que le *Mercur* a faites pendant l'année 1682 Par le

* *Archives de la Bastille*, Vol. IX, p. 11.

⁹ Lancaster, *Hist. of Fr. Dram. Lit in the Sev Cent.*, Pt. IV, Vol. II, pp. 547 f.

¹⁰ The story of *L'Epouse fugitive* concerns the adventures of Angélique, whose uncle Artamon tries to force her to marry a wealthy lawyer of 70 years, Ariste, whose illegitimate daughter, Chimène, helps Angélique resist, and recounts how her mother had been seduced by Ariste with the aid of du Perier. Chimène had been in love with handsome Belligny who had loved her, but she had been forced to marry her father's secretary and now feels only a sisterly affection for Belligny and aids him to win Angélique. There are many adventures, and Belligny much of the time is disguised as a woman. Angélique consents to marry Ariste, only to flee from the wedding banquet with Belligny and her wedding gift of 1000 écus. Belligny, provoked into fighting a duel, has to flee, but is caught trying to enter England in woman's clothing and brought back to Paris as an *Epouse fugitive*. As he is not the woman sought, he is released and sets out in search of Angélique, who, meantime, is looking for him in Holland. Finally they are reunited in England.

There are several bits of poor verse, as introduction, and inserted in the story: e. g.

Ce n'est pas la seule jeunesse
Que l'on doit accuser de manquer de sagesse
Les ans ne reglent pas toujours notre raison
Et l'amour a cet avantage
Qu'il domine aussy bien dans l'arriere saison
Que dans le printemps de notre age.

Crosnier seems to run to mixed 12 and 8 syl. lines, as in *L'Ombre de son rival*.

Sr J. Crosnier. A Amsterdam, chez le Sincere, 1683. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 9344 BL¹¹

IV. *Germanicus*, tragi-comedy. I have not personally seen a copy of this play. Victor Fournel, however, states in the introduction to the *Théâtre Choisi* d'E Boursault, Paris, 1883, in a note to page 36: "Nous avons entre les mains un *Germanicus* publié à Leyde chez Félix Lopez in-12, sans date, mais de la fin du XVII^e siècle, avec une dédicace à M. Hayde Kooper de Maarsseveen, secrétaire de la ville d'Amsterdam, signée Crosnier. Les bibliographes qui ont enregistré cette pièce ne se sont pas doutés qu'elle n'est autre que celle de Boursault, reproduite mot pour mot. Ce Crosnier, qui présente impudemment *Germanicus* comme le fruit de ses veilles et parle des applaudissements qu'il a reçus de la cour la plus délicate du monde, est probablement le même sous le nom duquel est enregistré *l'Ombre de son rival* (La Haye, 1683), qui n'est peut-être pas de lui davantage."

The play is attributed to Crosnier in the catalogue la Vallière—N 17745; cited by P. Lacroix, catalogue Soleinne—N. 1493.

More interesting are two works commonly attributed to Crosnier:

I. *Les Frayeurs de Crispin*, Comédie, Par le Sr C . . . A Leyde, chez Felix Lopez, 1682. This, as I discovered independently in my study of Crosnier, is a reduction into a single act of the five act comedy *L'Esprit Follet*, of Le Metel d'Ouville, published in 1642, and several times reprinted (Toussaint Quinet, MDCXLII—text which I used, 2 printings; A Anvers, chez Guillaume Colles, MDCLXII; La Coiffeuse a la Mode (sur l'imprimé a Paris) MDCXLIX; etc)

Excellent summaries of the two plays are given by Lancaster. I would merely call attention to the skill with which the approximately 1850 verses of the first play have been condensed to 750, preserving all the essential incidents and concentrating the action by omission of large portions of the long speeches which were quite *précieux* in tone. The soldering process is very well done, and though there may be a slight loss of preparation and motivation, it is only by comparison with the original that this is noticeable. The rôle of Crispin assumes more importance and the play was evidently rewritten to take advantage of the vogue which the actor who played under this name enjoyed. Professor Lancaster is doubtless right in assuming that it was written in Paris and was to have been presented at the Théâtre Guénégaud, as indicated by the list of accessories given in the *Mémoire de Mahelot*.¹² Why it should have been published at Leyden, by the same publisher as the *Germanicus*, unless taken there by Crosnier, it is difficult to say. Why, however, should Crosnier have signed the dedication

¹¹ Citations are given in J. Fransen, *Les Comédiens français en Hollande*, au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècles, Paris, 1925, p. 153 ff., and in G. Monval, *Le Laquais de Molière*.

¹² G. Montgrédien, *Les Grands Comédiens du XVII^e siècle*, chapter on Raymond Poisson "qui créa le type de Crispin," states that "en 1681 encore, le Théâtre Français donna *l'Ombre de son Rival*, comédie mêlée de danses et de musique, plus connue sous le titre de *Les Frayeurs de Crispin* du sieur Crosnier . . ." obviously an error.

of the tragedy taken from Boursault and used only an initial for the other which was less easy to identify? I think the authorship must remain in doubt, and that Crosnier should not be credited with this adaptation without further proof.

II. *Les Bagolins*, Comedie par Le Sieur C . . . , à Amsterdam, chez Henri Schelte MDCCV. Dedication à Monsieur Du Sassoind, praising him as a Maecenas, and also because "au milieu de l'embaras d'un riche commerce vous ne sçauriez oublier la langue de la vieille Rome, que vous n'avez que des passions douces dans une grande jeunesse & dans la magnificence d'un habillement regulier que vous êtes autant l'ennemie du faste, que l'ami de celui qui veut mourir.

Monsieur,

Votre tres-humble & tres-obeissant

Serviteur

C. D. L. B

The general theme is the same as *l'Ombre de son rival*, with the important exception that the personage of the servant is omitted and it is the lover, Leandre, who disguised himself to imitate the ridiculous suitor. The names of all the personages have been changed: Crispin becomes Bagolin; the father is Ragot; the girl, Angelique; and her servant, Lisette. The only other personage is the Notaire. Instead of the music and dance there is only one serenade, a song by Bagolin imitated by Leandre. There are beatings and other horseplay. Alexandrines are used throughout instead of the mixture found in the "vers libres" of the earlier play, but the quality is little better, if any. Many verses and turns of phrase are retained.

In the 4th scene, Bagolin appears with a trunk on his shoulders and utters a monologue beginning with these lines:

Grace a mon bon destin nôtre corvée est faite,
Maudit soit le loïeur de maudite Masette
Qui se coupant souvent & galoppant le trot,
Pire que Rossimant du fameux dom Quixot,
M'a pensé trente fois rompre col & bedaine.

He continues in this strain, then tries to prepare a compliment for his mistress:

Beau miel très-savoureux que doit lescher mon ame,
Doux beure qui se va tout fondre par ma flame,
Luisant sucre candy, cassonade d'amour,
Cresme de la beauté, tarte sortant du four. . . etc.

where one recognizes the language of Crispin.

Les Bagolins is a mediocre farce, but better constructed than its prototype, with more scenes between Bagolin and Leandre.

It appears very unlikely that Crosnier would have had opportunity to make this revision, closely guarded as he was in prison, or to have had it printed in Amsterdam, or that, after an absence of twenty years, he could address it to a man "dans une grande jeunesse." I do not believe therefore that Crosnier is to be identified

with C. D. L. B. although *Les Bagolins* is ascribed to him in the Catalogue de la Vallière, by Monval, by Caullery, and by others. It is quite possible, indeed, that *L'Ombre de son rival*, was also stolen by Crosnier from some source not yet discovered, but it does not seem to rise above the capacity of the author of *Le Mercure burlesque* and *L'Epouse fugitive* and we may let him retain it in his slender baggage, with the invention of the plot from which *Les Bagolins* was taken.¹³

CASIMIR D. ZDANOWICZ

The University of Wisconsin

ANC. FR. *Açopart* 'ETHIOPIEN'

M. Edward C. Armstrong a résumé dans *MP.* xxxviii, 243 seq., l'état de nos connaissances au sujet de ce nom de peuple. Pourrait-on affirmer, même après ce lumineux article, que l'étymologie du mot est bien établie? Je ne le crois pas. Selon M. Armstrong, qui modifie un peu la suggestion de Paul Meyer, *Rom.* viii, 437: *Aethiops* + suffixe *-art*, le point de départ serait le nom de la contrée *Aethiopia* > a. fr. *Etiopie*,

where the *ti* would in popular pronunciation have the sound *ts* (in writing, *ç* or *z* or *ti*). On *Etiopie* it would be wholly normal to construct a substantive of nationality *Egopart*, 'Ethiopian,' readily corrupted to *Açopart*; compare the variant spelling *Escopart* and the hesitation between Escalone and Ascalone as a city name . . . *Açopart* was evidently a quite current Syrian French term for 'Ethiopian.' When introduced from the Holy Land into the epic literature composed in France, it would be *Açopart* in the Centre and *Achopart* in the North, and it is in Northern manuscripts that the *-ch-* spelling is commonest.

¹³ In the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de feu M. Falconnet*, etc., Paris, MDCCLXIII, under No. 12106, appears *Ravissement de l'Helene d'Amsterdam*, Amst. 1683. = (*L'Epouse fugitive*, par Crosnier, Amst. 1682, in-12.) The work is anonymous and while it might possibly be by Crosnier, there is no resemblance in incident or style to *L'Epouse fugitive*, and I merely mention it. The complete title is: *Ravissement de l'Helene d'Amsterdam Contenant Des accidens étranges tant d'amour que de la Fortune, arrivez a une Demoiselle d'Amsterdam en plusieurs endroits du monde, & principalement en Turquie ou elle a été Esclave.*

Enrichi de Taille-douces.

A Amsterdam, chez Timothée Ten Hoorn,

Marchand Libraire dans le Nes

Vis a vis du Brachke-gront

MDCLXXXIII

in-12. Au lecteur, unsigned, 230 pp. Bib. Nat. Y^a 61571.

Le lecteur s'aperçoit d'emblée des difficultés inhérentes à cette explication: (1) le nom du pays **Egope* ou **Agope* avec ce *-ti-* > *ç* que M. Armstrong postule, n'est pas attesté—et, d'ailleurs, il serait isolé? d'un côté, a. fr. *precious*, *nacion*, avec *-ti-* développé à la manière savante, conservent le *-i-*, de l'autre ce n'est que le nexus cons. + *-ti-* qui donne *-c-* (*Quintiaco* > *Quincy*, Schwan-Behrens, § 195); *avarice* a *'-tia*; (2) les textes qui montrent la forme avec *-c-* transposé en *-ch-* dans *Achopart* ne sont pas exclusivement de provenance septentrionale; (3) le suffixe *-art* dans des noms de peuples, quoique bien connu par *Savoyard* et l'anglais *Spaniard* (= m. fr. *Espaignard*), est assez récent, comme je crois l'avoir prouvé dans mon article *Espagnol-Spagnuolo-Spaniard* (*Travaux du séminaire roman d'Istanbul* I, 218), et, bien que des augmentatifs semi-péjoratifs se trouvent dans des noms de peuples un peu partout (cf. encore Rohlf, *Arch. f. n. Spr.* 173, p. 216), on conçoit plutôt une variante semi-péjorative de la dénomination officielle (comme dans *espagnol*, *español* etc. > *espagnard*) que celle-ci prévalant dès le début, d'autant plus que M. Armstrong prouve que *cil d'Ethope* était la dénomination officielle et que *Ethiopien* ne se trouve qu'à partir du milieu du XVII^e siècle; (4) la variante *Escopart* s'explique moins facilement à partir d'un *Aethiopia* > **Agope* qu'à partir d'un verbe comportant des suffixes différents (*es-*, *a-*, *çoper*); (5) les recherches de Sainéan ayant trait à "l'étymologie indigène," et particulièrement les pages remarquables où il a démasqué les prétendus orientalismes de l'onomasiologie païenne dans les chansons de geste et en montre les "sources françaises," nous ont rendus circonspects en fait de reconstructions trop hardies: un mot a. fr. *Açopart* qui n'a que la syllabe *-op-* en commun avec le prétendu étymon *Aethiop-* est suspect *a priori*.¹

Or, à la p. 249, note 12, M. Armstrong mentionne le verbe a. fr.

¹ En s'appuyant sur l'étymologie *Açopart* = *Aethiops* par la base, je détruis aussi, si c'était encore nécessaire, tout rapport de ce personnage avec la légende de Polyphème chez les Ethiopiens—rapport fantaisiste que Settegast avait admis (*Das Polyphemmachen in im altfranz. Gedichten*, 1917) et que Stimming a suffisamment écarté (*Der festländ. Bueve de Hanzone* III b, 180). Il n'y a pas non plus d'argument à tirer du sens 'dull, awkward person' qu'aurait selon M. Armstrong (p. 244, n. 7) *Açopart* dans un passage de la *Geste de Liège* comme *Aethiops* en latin (chez Cicéron: *cum hoc homine*, an *cum stipite Aethiope*, *si in foro constitisses, nihil crederes interesse*, ce que Georges traduit: 'mit einem Stock, Däumling von Mohren'). Le vers en question (1117) de la *Geste de Liège* avait été déjà

(a) *çoper*, *achopper* 'trébucher,' envisage la possibilité d'une association d'idées entre *Açopa* et *broncher comme un Açopart*, locution que M. Armstrong doit avoir trouvée, bien qu'il n'en indique pas la provenance.² Ce verbe, précisément, me semble être à la base du nom du peuple.

En effet, un principe étymologique qui depuis à peu près 15 ans m'apparaît comme le seul légitime et que les polémiques de Sainéan n'ont pu que corroborer, me suggère de traiter, avant d'aborder des sources extra-françaises, un mot français d'abord comme *français*, de le décomposer en éléments donnés à l'intérieur de cette langue. A la lumière de ce principe, *Açopart* (*Achopart*) se décompose en suffixe *-ard* + *açoper* *achopper* 's'achopper, se heurter, buter,' le verbe dont P. Meyer a traité dans *Rom.* xiv, 126. Je dois faire ici la remarque que P. Meyer, après avoir formulé, avec pas trop d'entrain, l'idée reprise par M. Armstrong ("il ne semble pas qu'on

cité par P. Meyer avec la glose de l'éditeur Borgnet ("Pour *achopés*, arrêtés")) :

Et si vous ay vengiet des Romans *achopart*

Dans l'édition Borgnet il y a pourtant un point d'interrogation que Meyer a supprimé; comme le roi Tongris de Tongres, qui prononce ces paroles lors de sa victoire sur le roi de Rome, dit aussi à celui-ci, dans un défi avant la bataille décisive (v. 1092). *tu es remié*, nous traduirons (Romans) *achopart* de la même façon que *remié* 'hérétique, traître, felon.' Cette interprétation, appuyée qu'elle est déjà par le sens usuel de *achopart*, devient une certitude si nous lisons au v. 10619 de la même *Geste*: *Marvellu fist le jour* (dans une bataille) *sour Flamans achopars* (= 'traîtres,' l'épithète dénigrante par excellence appliquée à l'ennemi, qui au moyen âge, tient toujours un peu du Judas éternel trahissant la bonne cause—l'ennemi a toujours tort; puisque le type de 'celui qui a tort' est l'hérétique anti-chrétien, l'ennemi paraîtra logiquement anti-chrétien). L'éditeur Bormans (au t. vi du *Myreur des Histors*, p. 669) traduit ici correctement 'Injure: païen, mécréant' (de ces mêmes Flamands il est dit plus loin (v. 10625): *là sunt Flamens coarz Reculeit .I. petit con che soient Tartars* [!]).

²A la rigueur, *Açopart* pourrait être dérivé d'*açoper* 'heurter, buter, broncher' et avoir le sens originaire 'maladroit, butor'—mais je préfère pourtant l'explication donnée dans le texte.—Blondheim, *Les gloses franç* II, 49 a attesté un a. fr. *açoper* . . . *la vérité de l'evangile* 'discrediter, insulter,' litt. 'buter contre,' et Trénel, *L'ancien testament et la langue franç.*, pp. 221 et 622 a prouvé l'équivalence d'anc. fr. *açoparl* (fr. mod. *pierre d'achoppement*) et du gréco-lat biblique *petra scandal.* Les *Açoparts* seraient-ils donc tout simplement des 'trébucheurs [contre la Loi], des hérétiques vivant une vie de 'scandale'? Dans cette hypothèse *Açopart* serait une expression toute générique (= 'hérétique'), qui aurait pris un sens plus particulier (= 'Ethiopien') à cause des *flewa genua*.

y puisse voir autre chose qu'un mot formé de Aethiops . . .” — cette idée s'explique par le désir de P. Meyer de présenter *Achopart* en harmonie avec *Butentrot* et *Canelius* comme des souvenirs, dans les chansons de geste, des croisades), doit avoir changé un peu d'opinion sur *Achopart* dans l'article de *Rom.* XIV sur le verbe *açoper*, à en juger d'après les mots: “. . . les deux formes *açoper* et *achopar* étant entre elles dans le même rapport qu' *açopart* et *achopart*,” (avec renvoi à *Rom.* VII; à noter les minuscules): ce qui peut avoir (je m'exprime avec précaution) traversé la tête de P. Meyer, le rapport étymologique d'*Açopart* *Achopart* avec *açoper* *achoper*, je voudrais l'affirmer tout de go. Si *açoper* *achopper* est à la base du mot, on s'explique facilement la variante *Escopart* (*ad-* > *ex-*, cf. en catalan *en-* dans *ensopegar*, 'trébucher'). Mais comment justifier le choix d'un + *aç(ch)opp-ard* pour une dénomination des Ethiopiens? Le témoignage d'Albert d'Aix, historien du XII^e siècle, qui utilise probablement des traditions épiques courantes parmi les croisés français en Terre-Sainte (v. Armstrong, p. 244), pourra nous aider. Voici le passage, cité par P. Meyer et M. Armstrong:

Nam Azopart, qui flevis genibus, suo more, solent bellum committere, praemissi in fronte belli graviter sagittarum grandine Gallos impugnaverunt

(suivent les détails des clairons et tambours par lesquels ils effraient l'ennemi, des *flagella ferrata* qui pénètrent les hauberts et boucliers, etc.).

Les détails des Ethiopiens ouvrant la bataille avec les genoux courbés—pratique qui semble être une façon de protéger leurs corps pendant qu'ils lancent l'attaque—doit avoir prêté, chez les croisés, à une interprétation plaisante, peut-être dans le sens de ce qu'on appella plus tard *faire le choppet du pied* ou *bailler le choppet de la jambe*, ou aussi *faire le jambet* ou *jamber* (Du Cange s. vv. *assopire* et *gamba*), c'est à dire du *croc-en-jambe*. Le mot *choppet*, qui est évidemment un dérivé de la famille d' *aç(ch)opper*, n'est attesté qu'à partir de 1394, mais rien ne nous empêche d'admettre l'existence, deux ou trois siècles avant son attestation, d'un mot désignant une ruse aussi élémentaire et aussi populaire (particulièrement entre enfants), en l'espèce d' *aç(ch)opper* au sens de 'donner le *croc-en-jambe*.' En Suisse, où, d'après le *Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande*, *achopper* dans le sens 'buter contre un obstacle, donner le *croc-en-jambe*'; 'broncher' (dit d'un cheval)

est conservé, je connais le nom de famille *Choppard*, qui sera peut-être aussi un continuateur de notre *Achopart*. M. Gauchat mentionne à l'historique le piém. *a pè sopet* 'à cloche-pied' et *asypar* 'inciampare' dans quelques points de l'ASI, qui prouvent la parenté avec l'ital. *zoppo*.

Ce détail des *flexa genua*, attribué aux Ethiopiens dans la bataille, expliquera aussi pourquoi ils apparaissent dans les chansons de gestes dansant dans une procession ou dans une avance triomphale et quelquefois sont même identifiés avec des *tombeors* ('jumpers, leapers, tumblers'), comme le suppose M. Armstrong (p. 248):

The clerk Albert d'Aix, who possessed a clear conception of geographical connotation and who has done us good service by specifying the basic meaning of the name, may have been influenced by the popular connotation when he referred to the knee movements of the *Açoparts*.

Un passage comme *Roman d'Alex. I* (*Tumbent y açopart e chantent jogleor*), où *açopart* n'est plus un nom de peuple, mais un nom de profession, ne doit pas nécessairement prouver que "it must have been the *Açoparts* who served in the function of *tombeors* for the Franks of the kingdom of Jerusalem," mais que les Francs ont imité par plaisanterie, "sur la scène," ces mouvements de jambe "éthiopiens," en les détournant de leur sens primitif, comme l'on fait encore aujourd'hui, à l'époque du folklore vulgarisé, de nombreuses danses d'indigènes dont la valeur, rituelle ou guerrière, est oubliée en faveur de l'aspect mimique ou décoratif. Un noir grotesque, comiquement barbare, et dansant, figure d'ailleurs encore aujourd'hui sur nos scènes: le Monostatos de la *Flûte enchantée* de Mozart.

Je crois d'ailleurs que les *flagella ferrata* que mentionne Albert d'Aix ont aussi inspiré le poète du *Bueve de Hantone*, texte que M. Armstrong ne mentionne pas, probablement parce que *Açopart* y apparaît comme nom propre. Mais M. Brugger, *Zeitschr. f. frz. Spr.* xxxix, 176 a bien montré que dans les mss. anglonormands de ce texte l'*Escopart* et dans les continentaux un *Açopart*,³ donc

³ Dans la version 1 cont., v. 3927 seq., nous assistons, fait qui corrobore les dires de M. Brugger, à la genèse de ce nom: c'est un nom de baptême que donne le chrétien Bueve à ce grand diable sorti de l'enfer (v. 3896) et venu 'de la terre de là, d'outre trois mers, u dieus noiant nen a' (v. 3894 seq.):

3927 Li anemis tantost l'en apela.
 'Com as tu non?' Et cil mot ne sona,

l'état appellatif du nom, représente la tradition originale. Eh bien, dans quelques versions publiées par Stimming, le géant sarrazin est muni d'une massue (version continentale I: *bastoncel*; anglo-normande *mace*); dans toutes c'est un coureur admirable (vers. contin. II), il saute merveilleusement bien, cf. la scène du baptême

Tant par fu fiers que parler ne daigna;
 'Valés,' fait il, 'tu me vergonges ja,
 Baptisié t'ai, *mes nons te remanra*,
Que Açopart cascuns t'apelera,
 Tes parins sui . . .
 Jou te faç chou que molt bien te vaura,
 Tant seras fier que home ne douteras,
 Ne ja chevaus devant toi ne cora, . . .'

Stimming remarque ingénument: "*Baptisié t'ai*. Der Ausdruck wird also hier von einem Teufel, der sicher kein Christ war, gebraucht" — mais l'essentiel c'est que même ce diable évadé de l'enfer, sorte de Morgante avant-la-lettre, *peut* devenir chrétien (et invincible) par l'effet de la grâce acquise par le baptême. Ce qui nous intéresse ici, c'est que dans cette parodie bénigne du baptême, le nom *Açopart*, probablement au sens amical de '(ex)-hérétique,' est donné ici par une décision toute volontaire de la part du parrain qui choisit un nom approprié pour son 'valet,' celui de sa provenance ethnique (comme le laquais à un moment donné en France s'appelait *Basque*). De là s'explique v. 3955: *Son Açopart maintenant apela*, où son *Açopart* = 'son valet, le valet qu'il avait appelé A., l'A. de sa façon' (et plus tard un *Açopart* dans le récit du bourgeois au vers 4904 correctement restitué par M. Brugger: *Un Açopart qui le devoit garder* = 'un valet noir'). Si après la scène du baptême nous trouvons *Dans Açopart n'i vout plus demorer* (v. 3967), *Dist Açopart* (v. 3976), l'effet comique subsiste, comme si on parlait au XVII^e siècle d'un *Monsieur Basque*. Dans la version continentale II, 4046 le géant païen répond à la question: "des Sarrazins ou de chrestiens nes?" — "*Açopars sui, de Popelicans (= publicanus) nes*" ou "Je suis Popelicans," et l'auteur l'appelle désormais soit l'*Achopars*, ce qui a été noté par Stimming (II b, 241), p. ex. 4206 *Li Achopars i va du pié hurter* (serait-ce encore une allusion à *achopper* 'heurter'?), soit, sans article, *Achopars*; cf. *Achopars l'ot* (v. 4070, 4135, 4179; 4205); dans les allocutions je crois voir que les chrétiens l'appellent plutôt *amis*, tandis que les païens lui disent (v. 4553): *Achopart sire*; comme nom de baptême il reçoit au v. 4766 le nom *Guy* d'après le père de Bueve (épisode qui est rappelé ainsi dans le récit de Bueve au v. 5845: "Illuec fis jou mon païen convertir, Et en sains fons baptisier et tenir" — *mon païen* rappelant le *mon Açopart* de la version I) et pourtant, et quoi qu'il ne jure plus par les dieux païens, mais par Dieu, il sera appelé dans tout le poème (*l'*) *Açopart* — "nach dem Gesetz, nach dem er angetreten." Dans la version continentale III le géant est dès sa première apparition au v. 4121 *Açoupart le tirant*, et *Açoupart* sera toujours un nom propre dans ce poème. Stimming (III b, 380) pense que l'introduction brusque du personnage doit nous faire supposer la perte de

où il saute dans la pile et en sort en sautant (Stimming III b, 305) : *Achoupars saute dans la cuve—l'Escoupart salt dedens*. On dira avec raison que l'*Achoupart* (*Esc-*) est le type du *vilain* ou *homme sauvage* (all. *wilder Mann*), bien connu par *Yvain* et *Aucassin et Nicolette* et dont MM. Mulertt et Giese ont traité (*Zeitschr. f. frz. Spr.* LVI, 69 et 491 seq.)—mais nous assistons ici plutôt à une évo-

quelques vers avant 4121—je ne le crois pas. l'épithète *le tirant* est une caractérisation suffisante pour les rhapsodes anciens français et *Açoupart* n'est pas conçu dans cette version comme 'un Açoupart.' Enfin dans la version anglonormande le *veleyn* (= *vilain*) répond à la question au sujet de son nom (v. 1700) : 'Jeo sui,' dist-il, 'un fere publicant / e ay a non *Escoupart fort et combatant*,' dans la narration de l'auteur il sera appelé *l'Escoupart* (v. 1865, où il saute (!) dans le bateau *joyns pes*) ou *Escoupart* (v. 1978); les chrétiens l'adressent au vocatif: *Escoupart* (v. 1822); les païens, plus conscients de sa provenance 'de chez eux,' lui demandent (v. 1880) : *Es tu l'Escoupart*, et, en parlant de lui, disent (v. 1852) *jeo vey l'Escoupart*.

Nous voyons donc toutes les possibilités d'un nom de peuple évoluant vers un nom propre développées. quelquefois (vers. III contin.) c'est le nom propre qui prime, quelquefois au contraire (vers anglonorm) le nom du peuple; plus le personnage est vu comme une personnalité individuelle (quand les chrétiens s'adressent à leur *ami*), le nom se dévêt du sens collectif, qu'au contraire ses compatriotes païens ne cessent de lui faire sonner à l'oreille.

De la même façon, le moyen âge ne faisait peut-être pas comme c'est notre habitude moderne, de différence nette entre le nom propre et l'appellatif qui est à la base d'un nom (j'ai montré ceci à diverses reprises: pour la *Trotaconventos* de l'archiprêtre de Hita dans *ZRPh* LIV, p. 264, pour la Béatrice de la Vita Nova dans *Travaux du sémin. rom. d'Istanbul* I) : de même, la ligne de démarcation entre le nom collectif et l'individuel ne sera jamais nette pour le peuple médiéval qui n'avait pas le respect de l'état civil soigneusement marqué dans les registres: * *l'Açoupart*, même après avoir été baptisé *Guy*, pourra être soit *Açoupart* (nom propre rappelant son peuple) soit *un Açoupart*. Comment expliquerait-on, par notre pensée moderne, le nom que s'attribue *l'Escoupart* dans la vers. anglonorm.: 'J'ai a nom *Escoupart fort et combatant*'? Le nom et la description de l'être se fondent ici dans une sorte d'unité, en vertu de la conviction profonde du moyen âge de l'identité du nom et de la chose (*nomina consequentia rebus*): notre protagoniste ne porte pas de nom détachable de lui, il est intimement lié à son 'essence.' Le nom, pour le moyen âge, n'est pas qu'un nom (cf. les *Agulani*, nom de peuple, que mentionne Tudebode, l'historien cité par P. Meyer, avec les nombreux *Agolands*, individus païens, dans les chansons de Geste)—c'est un *εἶδος*, une réalité.

* Le nom propre au moyen âge est plutôt 'parlé' qu' 'écrit,' cf. *Cento Novelle antiche* LIII: "uno piovano, il quale avea nome il piovano Porcellino"—c'est le nom qu'on donne au curé en parlant de lui.

lution de l'*Açopart* en 'homme sauvage' ou *vilain* (il est appelé ainsi dans la version anglonormande), parallèle à celle de l'*Açopart* en *tumeor*. Ce sont probablement la massue traditionnelle chez l' 'homme sauvage' (v. Mulertt et Giese) et l'aspect terrible de ce personnage qui doivent avoir été les points de contact. L'homme sauvage était déjà chez Chrétien susceptible de se transformer en Maure, cf. l. c. v. 288: "*Un vilain, qui ressanbloit mor, / Grant est hideus a desmesure, / Einsi tres leide creature / Qu'an ne pourroit dire de boche* — d'autre part l'*Açopart* de *Bueve* est en général une créature du diable. Nous assistons donc à l'évolution: 'homme sauvage' > 'Maure' > 'Açopart,' c'est dire que le sobriquet d'une certaine population exotique se fond dans le vague du 'folklore géographique' du Moyen Âge, monde fermé à qui un classement simple s'impose: *Païen ont tort* . . . Tous les non-chrétiens deviendront 'les autres,' 'les Barbares,' 'les Sarrazins' et toutes les dénominations de peuples exotiques se ressembleront dans leur vague: tout de suite se présente à notre mémoire le passage de la *Chanson des Saisnes*, où Jean Bodel donne, comme le dit bien Bédier, *Légendes épiques* IV, 47 "ce dénombrement fantasque de l'armée de Guiteclin":

Danois, Saisne, Lutis, Hongre, Rous et Hermin
[Et] la gent de Illande, Leonois, Pelerin . . .
Cheneleu, Açopart, Persan, Tur, Bedoin:
Dou regné de Marec vindrent li Barbarin
Et li Amoravi et li Alexandrin.

De même dans *Gormont et Isembart* Gormond, 'celui d'Orient,' 'empereur de Leutiz,' 'Arabe,' "commande des Irlandais, lesquels voisiaient avec des Sarrazins . . . , avec des Turcs et des Persans." "N'est-ce pas dire que l'auteur de *Gormond*, tout comme les poètes de *Roland*, d'*Aiquin*, des *Saisnes*, d'*Aliscans*, etc., voulant ranger en bataille toute la 'païenie' contre toute la chrétienté, a employé pêle-mêle les noms des peuples les plus hétéroclites . . . ?" On pourrait ajouter que ce pêle-mêle barbare, ce pandémonium hétéroclite qui est toujours présent à l'esprit du poète orthodoxe, est pour lui la manifestation même du désordre, des "variations" inhérentes au paganisme et aux assauts du Malin, alors que la loi chrétienne est "une," simple et éternelle. Les "chimères" de Notre-Dame sont multiples et déconcertantes dans leur variété, comme les attaques du diable, la vraie religion n'a qu'une seule beauté. Les *Açoparts* sont une variante de la laideur diabolique jugée d'avance par Dieu.

GERMAIN COLIN BUCHER AND GIROLAMO ANGERIANO

The poems of Germain Colin (c. 1475-1545) were published for the first time by Joseph Denais about fifty years ago.¹ The author, a native of Angers, was Secretary to the Grand Master of Malta, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, and before the recovery of his poems only somewhat faintly known to literary history as a partisan of Marot against Sagon. His verses are interesting; they are written in a style perhaps as lively as that of Saint-Gelais and on the whole smoother. Denais goes further (p. 67):

Germain Colin Bucher est un écrivain qui ne méritait point le profond oubli où il est tombé. Bien plus! au risque d'être accusé de me passionner trop pour ses écrits, j'oserai poser cette question. son contemporain Clément Marot est-il vraiment supérieur à Colin Bucher?

Apart from some fifty epitaphs and about as many other verses of occasional inspiration, most of the 290 poems first published by Denais are amatory verses addressed by Colin to his mistress, Gylon. In these poems to Gylon, Denais very rightly finds most of Colin's charm; here "l'esprit vif, alerte, pétillant de saillies, s'élève par moment à un rare degré d'énergie et d'autorité" (p. 68). He gives several examples.

Je prends encore au hasard ce petit conte: *Des cruaultez de Gylon*. N'est-il pas pour plaire, dans sa gracieuse naïveté:

Quand Narcissus se rend a la fontaine,
Ou il mourut par sort adventureux,
Il fut mue en florette certaine
Dont il a loz eternal et heureux,
Car bien souvent les bergiers amoureux
La vont cueillir es-florissants preaux,
Et quand et quand bergieres deux a deux
En font boucquets, ceintures et chappeaulx
Qu'ils prisent plus que roynes leurs aneaulx.
Hyacinthus ce bel enfant aussy
Souzb accable de pierres a monceaulx
Fut transforme par Phoebus en soucy.
Et Adonis de beaute tant fulcy,
Qui de Venus aymoît tant l'embrasseure,
D'ung fier sangler fut a la mort transy
Et converty en rouge floriture.

¹ *Un Emule de Clément Marot; les poésies de Germain Colin Bucher*, Paris (Techener), 1890.

Mais toy' Pourtant que ta fiere nature
 Au gre d'amour ne veult faire partie
 Et que tu es fiere et rebelle et dure,
 Dure seras en dur roc convertie.

Comme cette interjection "Mais toy!" succédant à ce joli tableau produit un effet puissant! Comme le ton change et arrive de la grâce du récit mythologique, par un art véritable, aux "duretés" de la fin que le poète réservait à son insensible Gylon!

Regretfully we shall have to moderate somewhat these expressions of admiration. A sixteenth-century poet may be safely praised for the vivacity of his language, but when, as here, the critic approaches the topics of arrangement and invention, he is apt to be at any moment confounded by a discovery of the poet's source. All credit for the invention and arrangement of the present poem belongs to Girolamo Angeriano, from whom Colin Bucher has translated it. Still, we may, I think, agree that translation from a somewhat prim Latin into the more garrulous vernacular has increased its charm. Colin has not impoverished it. It is almost as though Angeriano, whose mind after all functioned in a modern language, had forced into the tight lacing of his Latin the vernacular poem which Colin has liberated.

AD CAELIAM

Dum cernit nitida sese Narcissus in unda
 Et perit, in florem labitur omne decus.
 Saepe illum in pratis pueri et legere puellae
 Texentes pexis florida serta comis.
 Dum pressat disci moles onerosa Hyacinthum,
 Quaesitus Phoebos flos tener haesit humo.
 Ille etiam rabies apri quem dira furentis
 Pressit, Acidalium per nemus omne rubet.
 Tu quia nec flammam nosti, neque dulcis amoris
 Praemia, eris duro in marmore dura silex.

Even more hazardous is the search for personal confessions in the small poems of the sixteenth century. Denais writes (p. 15):

Dans son prologue il raconte comment, séduit par une lecture de Virgile, il voulut d'abord goûter à la poésie. Mais rebuté dès les premières difficultés il eut le malheur de trop écouter Vénus. . . .

Mais las Phœbus a la barbe doree
 Voyant d'en hault que son eau vouloit prendre
 Pour en goustier, sans plus m'alla deffendre
 Et prohiber le goust de la boyture,
 Dont honte et dueil me vindrent tant surprendre

Que longtemps quis au centre sepulture.
 Mais puy Venus, d'amoureuse nature,
 Prenant pitie de mes griefs et labeurs
 Me dist Colin, va prendre nourriture
 En ma fontaine. . . .

But Colin's very Prologue is only a translation of Angeriano's third poem. The lines corresponding to those just quoted are as follows:

DE SEIPSO

Aonium ut fierem vates haurire liquorem
 Optabam, et lauri nectere fronde caput.
 Accessi ad fontes, vidit me Phœbus ab alto
 Culmine, quae poscis dona negantur, ait.
 Ejectus fleui, tandem miserata labores
 Alma Venus, Paphias i bibe, dixit, aquas. . . .

The reference to Virgil, for what it may be worth, is Colin's own. Denais' statement (p. 34), "L'existence de Germain Colin paraît s'être achevée dans une sombre mélancholie, un véritable dégout de tout," may be true, but it is not well founded by the quotation of his seventh poem, since this too is from Angeriano. Colin may indeed have become gloomy and poor, and have attributed his misfortunes to love (p. 15), but the verses given as evidence are again from Angeriano. Denais embarks (pp. 15-21) on a sketch of the history of the poet's passion for Gylon, but virtually all the poems he cites, some of them fairly long ones, are translated from the same Latin poet. Even the "portrait très flatteur" (p. 16) of this lady is really a portrait of Angeriano's Caelia. So much for the editor's statement (p. 42) that, "En cette introduction nous nous sommes attaché surtout à citer les vers qui ont un intérêt biographique, historique, sans nous occuper beaucoup ici de leur valeur littéraire."

Fifty of Colin Bucher's poems are from Angeriano, surely a large debt to owe to a single source. About one-quarter of Angeriano's book has gone to make about one-sixth of Colin's. There was nothing unusual in the mere fact of borrowing from Angeriano; indeed, if invention gives title to ownership, this Latin poet may claim a considerable share in the verse of the sixteenth century whether Italian, French, or English; but no one else, I think, has pillaged him so thoroughly as Colin Bucher. His *Ἐρωτοπαύγων* was published at Florence in 1512, but only became influential

when republished at Naples in 1520. The poet was a Neapolitan, but virtually nothing is known of him apart from this book. The mere accident of his name may have given him a special interest for Germain Colin of Angers. Possibly also the fact that Angeriano's book had become very well-known may help explain why Colin failed to publish his own, so deeply indebted to it. Finally, Colin's smooth style is certainly in part due to the discipline of his Latin model.

The following table gives the incipits of Colin Bucher's poems and of their originals. References are to Denais' edition of Colin and to the Naples, 1520, edition of Angeriano's *Ἑρωτοπαίγνιον*:

Colin Bucher

- p. 77. *Lisant ung jour.*
 80. *Voullant sçavoir.*
 82. *Tu le sçays bien.*
 82. *Pleurant je vins.*
 82. *Amours dormant.*
 83. *Jadis vivoys.*
 84. *Tu es ung Dieu.*
 84. *Quand Narcissus.*
 85. *Tout mon esprit.*
 86. *Jadis Paris veid.*
 86. *Trop se deçoit.*
 86. *Le feu mollist.*
 87. *Mon compagnon.*
 90. *Jehan de Paris.*
 91. *Jusques au fons.*
 92. *Que paings-tu.*
 94. *Cil qui premier.*
 96. *Pourquoy fuis-tu.*
 96. *Quand Jupiter Gylon.*
 97. *Pallas pour ses vertus.*
 97. *Ne te fie aux humains.*
 98. *Mais pourquoy penses-tu.*
 99. *Gylon se veid.*
 100. *La voyez-vous enfee.*
 102. *Sept signes sont.*
 104. *Ou est Scopas.*
 104. *Si je compose.*
 106. *Conseille moy.*
 106. *Toutes les nuictz.*
 107. *Gylon lisant.*
 108. *Jupiter devint or.*
 113. *L'autre nuytee.*
 117. *Venus dormoit.*
 118. *Que advises-tu.*

Angeriano

- sig. a2. *Aonium ut fierem.*
 e4. *Ut scirem quanto.*
 b2. *Saevis, nosco, noces.*
 b4. *Flens veni in terras.*
 b2. *Quum dormiret Amor.*
 b1. *Vivebam, nunc.*
 a4. *Es deus, ambobus.*
 b3. *Dum cernit nitida.*
 c1. *Tota anima ex oculis,*
 b4. *Tres quondam nudas.*
 c4. *Fallitur esse deum.*
 b4. *Ferrum flamma domat.*
 c4. *Cur sic exardes?*
 b4. *Fingeret ut sculptor.*
 b4. *Mirabar (memini).*
 b3. *Quid pingis pictor.*
 e4. *In tabula primus.*
 b4. *Cur linquis caelum.*
 c1. *Juppiter humanae.*
 b1. *Numen habes Pallas.*
 d1. *Ne fide humanis.*
 c4. *Cur immortalem te.*
 a4. *Auspiciens pictam.*
 d1. *Ecce tumet forma.*
 d2. *Septem errant ignes.*
 b4. *Nunc ubi Praxiteles.*
 c4. *Si molles elegos.*
 b1. *Consule quid faciam.*
 d4. *Non sinit culex.*
 e4. *Quum legeret.*
 e1. *Fit cyenus, taurus.*
 c4. *Armatur telis puer.*
 e4. *Forte sub umbrosa.*
 e4. *Quid speculum spectas.*

Colin Bucher

- p. 119. J'alloys chantant
 120. Gylon filort.
 120. Qui t'a baillez.
 122 Si mon regard.
 122. Gylon sommeille.
 130. Ung jour Gylon.
 132. Les dieux au ciel.
 133. Que me chault il.
 149. Veulx tu sçavoir.
 151. Du beau printems.
 156. Quand Cupilo veit.
 157. Le grand yver.
 168. Apres ma mort.
 174. Espoir abuse nostre vie.
 179. Bien tost apres.
 194. Sus ung drap d'or.
 199. Quant Venus veit.

Angeriano

- sig c2. Cantabam in sylvis.
 c4. Caelia dum teretem.
 d4. Quis tibi tot.
 b4. Si nimis intueor.
 a4. Caelia fatur, Amor.
 d4. Aestiva recubans.
 a4. Cernentes superi.
 a4. Quid mihi barbaricae.
 a4 Post obitum non.
 f2. Veris honor flos.
 e4. Vidit ut aetherios.
 d4. Pelliceam induerat.
 f2 In cinerem fuero.
 a4. Ludificat vitam spes.
 e4. Exoriens postquam.
 b4. Se nudam aurato.
 b4 Partenopen quum laeta.

Angeriano himself has his sources, though he treats them with much more originality than Colin shows in borrowing from him. He is perhaps most deeply indebted to the Greek Anthology,² and hence served as an important conduit by which its themes made their way to the vernacular poets. Some seventeen of Colin Bucher's poems specified above are thus ultimately of Greek origin. But this matter, and also the matter of Colin's other direct sources, may best be left for another occasion.

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

ÖWER KOPP UN WUNNEN

Im *Schleswig-Holsteinischen Wörterbuch* v (1935), 739 notiert Mensing eine Eiderstedter Redensart wie folgt: "he keem to Water over Kopp un Wunnen." Herkunft dunkel (zu *winden*?).—Die selbe Wendung findet sich a. a. o. III (1931), 257/258 ebenfalls ohne den Versuch einer Erklärung.

Kopp oder *Kupp* ist in Schleswig im Sinne von *Erhöhung* gebräuchlich. Mensing a. a. o. III, 260 bringt mehrere Belege dafür, daß "*Kopp* in Ortsnamen eine Anhöhe bezeichnet." (vgl. dazu schlesisch *Schneekoppe*). In *Wunnen* sehe ich das schon im 9 Jh.

² See the present writer's *Greek Anthology in Italy*, Ithaca, 1935, p. 169.

als selbständiges Substantiv verlorene *Wunne*, erhalten in der weiderechtlichen Formel *Wunne* und *Weide* in der Benennung *Wonnemonat* (= Mai, der Monat, in dem das Vieh auf die Weide getrieben wird).

Eiderstedt ist eingedeichtes Marschland; seine Wiesen sind durch Dammbauten gegen die See geschützt; über *Kopp un Wunnen* zum Wasser kommen heißt, sich nicht an den gebahnten Weg halten sondern querfeldern über Deich und Weide laufen, über Erhöhungen und Vertiefungen, über Einfriedung und Hindernis,—über Stock und Stein.

Daß ein dem Deutschen verloren gegangenes *Wunne* sich grade im äußersten nordwestlichen Aussenposten des deutschen Sprachgebiets erhalten haben soll, ist nicht unglaublich, wenn wir auf seine Fortexistenz auch im Schweizerischen verweisen können. Wander belegt im *Deutschen Sprichwörter-Lexikon* v (1880), 452 *Wun* aus Solothurn, wozu schon Stalder (*Versuch eines schweizer. Idiotikons*, II [1813], 459) für Zürich mit heranzuziehen ist. Jeder, der mit der neueren Literatur zur Wortforschung vertraut ist, kennt jene merkwürdigen Übereinstimmungen zwischen den entlegenen Südwest- und Nordwest-Ausläufern des deutschen Sprachfeldes, die so oft ältere Zustände konservieren.¹ In unserm Fall kommt noch hinzu, daß *Wunne* durch ein geographisch und phonetisch gleich benachbartes friesisches *Wung* gestützt sein mochte. Der Guttural wird nicht gesprochen und wirkt sich artikulatorisch nur als schwache Nasalisierung des *n* aus. *Wun* oder *Won*, alts., ags. *wang* 'Feld, Ebene,' anord. *vangr* 'Aue' hat im Friesischen bis heute eine Bedeutung, die es in die nächste Nachbarschaft von *Wun* und *Weide* rückt. Nach Mensing a. a. o. v, 738 wurde "das *Wunge*-Land als gemeinschaftliche Weide benutzt. . . . In Nordfriesland bezeichnete man mit *Wong* die Ackergemeinschaft mehrerer an einem bestimmten Feld, das nur gemeinschaftlich bearbeitet werden durfte." So viel ich sehe, handelt es sich nicht eigentlich um Ackerland und Ackerarbeit sondern genau im Sinne des alten *Wunne* um Wiesenland und demzufolge Heuen. Das geht klar aus einer Beliebung von Bordelum 1754 hervor, die Mensing a. a. o. v, 525 zitiert: "Wenn es zehn Tage nach Mai ist, so sollen die *Wanlemmer* nicht mehr in der *Wung* gehen." Friesisch *wanie*

¹ Letzte, beste Zusammenfassung bei O. Springer: German and West Germanic. *Germanic Review*, XVI (1941), 3 ff.

ist gewöhnen; *Wanlemmer* sind die noch nicht entwohnten Lämmer. Eine Kombination von *Wun* und *Wunne* verbietet die Lautgeschichte, aber zur Erklärung der Erhaltung von schleswigisch *Wunne* darf man das friesische Wort heranziehen, dessen Bedeutsamkeit sich im Sinne der Konservierung der alten Form hat auswirken können.

Über *Wunne* sind ja die Akten noch nicht geschlossen. Das *Grimmsche Wörterbuch* ist bis zum Wort *Wonne* noch nicht vorgegangen; weder das Badische, noch das Schweizerische, noch das Rheinische, noch das Bayrisch-österreichische Mundarten-Lexikon haben den späten Buchstaben in Angriff genommen. Für das Schwabische ist *Wunne* erschöpfend behandelt in Fischers *Schwabischem Wörterbuch* VI (1924), 954 f., wodurch die Ausführungen Gotzes im *Grimmschen Wörterbuch* XIV, I (1915) 550, (Lemma: *Weide*) weitgehend überholt sind. Götze selbst scheint der gleichen Ansicht. Denn während er als Bearbeiter des *Grimmschen Wörterbuchs* der Auffassung Braunes (*Beiträge* XIV [1889], 370 folgt,² folgt er in seiner Bearbeitung von Kluges *Etymologischem Wörterbuch* (1934), 698 die in allen zehn Auflagen von 1883-1924 wieder und wieder gemachte Feststellung Kluges: "Man halt ahd. *winna* 'Weideland' für eins mit *Wonne*; doch hat jenes mit got. *winja* seine eigene Wortgeschichte." und ersetzt sie durch den Satz: "Wohl als landwirtschaftliches Fachwort hat sich *Wonne* aus 'Lust' zu 'Weideplatz' entwickelt in got. *winja*, anord. *vin*, ahd. *winne*, ablautend ahd. *wunnja*, mhd. *wunne* 'Weideland.'" Eine solche Entwicklung rechnet mehr mit nomadischen als mit sesshaft bauerlichen Verhältnissen und kann daher nur bedingt befriedigen.

Es scheint mir methodologisch erforderlich, das Wort *winna* von dem Bestandteil der Rechtsformel *wunne und weide* scharf zu trennen. Wie so häufig in der juristischen Terminologie des deutschen Altertums ist *wunne und weide* eine tautologische Alliteration (vgl. Grimm: *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer* [1828], 7. 13 ff.). Die den einen Begriff doppelnde Formel gibt ihr die rechtskräftige Prägung und macht sie verbindlich; ohne sie wäre sie null und nichtig. Diese altgermanische Rechtsformel lebt bis in die

² *Grimm Wtb.* XIV, I, 550: "Im deutschen ist *winne* (got. *winja*, anord. *vin*. 'grasplatz') schon seit dem anfang des 9. jarh. auszer gebrauch gekommen. in unserer formel wurde es, wie in *winnemânôth* unter dem einfluss von *wonne* umgebildet."

neuere Zeit, wie die Mundarten-Wörterbücher von Schmeller bis Fischer reichlich beweisen. Neulich ist sie mir aufgestossen in einem Thurgauer Mandat vom November 1530 (*Abschiede* IV 1b, 849): "Ordnung und Satzung, wie sich gemeine Landschaft Thurgow der christlichen Reformation . . . glychformig gemacht," wo unter den Strafen für Verletzung der Kirchengebote Ausschluß von *Wun und Weid* genannt ist. So zahe *Wunne* sich im alten Rechtsbegriff erhalten hat, so schwächlich war es als separates Wort, wo es nur im Kompositum *Wonnemonat* fortwest, ohne noch verstanden zu werden. Da erlag es der Sinnes-Kontamination mit *Wonne*.

Die Veränderung von *winnemânôth* in *wunnmânôth* mag durch das Übergreifen eines zu benachbarten Bedeutungsfeldes begünstigt gewesen sein, obwohl man angesichts von Schreibungen wie *uwinnisamit* für *uwunnisamit* oder *uwinse* statt *uunse* (vgl. Baesecke: *Einführung in das Althochdeutsche*. [1918], 284) nicht mit weit hergeholten Erklärungen zu operieren braucht. Wenn Braune seine Ausführungen über *winne* und *wunne* (a. a. o. 371) damit abschließt, die Überführung der *i* in die *u*-Form "konnte eben nur durch die Volksetymologie geschehen, rein lautlich ist sie unmöglich," so hat er an die gelaufigste Ablautreihe nicht gedacht (*Findelkind—Fundgrube; Bund—Angebunde*), was bei einem Gelehrten seines Ranges etwas Ruhrendes hat.

Tatsache ist, daß ahd. *winna* schon im 9. Jh. so sehr ausser Gebrauch ist, daß die Abschreiber von Glossen es durch andere Zusätze erläutern. Um 1000 kann es als ausgestorben gelten. Das Weiterleben von *winna* in der Rechts-Tautologie erklärt sich aus der Festigkeit alliterierender Rechtsformeln, wobei wir nur zu erklären hätten, wieso dieses *winna* denn ganz den gleichen Weg zu *wunne* zurücklegt wie das gewöhnliche Wort *Wonne*, mit dem es doch nichts zu tun hat.

Bei Graff (*Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz* II [1836], 796), Schade (*Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch* II [1872/1882], 1212) erscheint das erste Glied der Formel immer als *wunna*, und als *wunne*, *wünne* überdauert es unverändert die Jahrhunderte. Die Form *wonne* ist vor allem mitteldeutsch; das Wort geht in seinen Lautformen mit *Wonne* absolut parallel, ohne daß die Bedeutung je kontaminiert. Fischer belegt noch aus dem 17. Jh. die Wendung *Wun und Waid, Trib und Trat*, lateinisch *apricus* wird wiedergegeben als *wonnesam*, woraus sich die Bedeutung einer trockenen Hochtrift für *wonne* ergibt. Petri erzählt in seiner Chronik aus

dem Anfang des 17. Jh. *Der Stadt Mühlhausen Geschichten*: "Die Statt Mühlhaussen hat im jahr 1437 von Grave Ludwigen vnnd Ulrichen . . . die zwey dorffere Iltzach vnnd Motenheim mit hohen vnnd nideren gerichtten, zwingen, bannen, wunnen, waiden . . . an sich erkaufft vnnd bezahlt" (Entnommen aus Martin-Lienhart: *Wtb. d. elsäss. Mundarten* II [1907], 832).

Der Übergang einer Bedeutung *Weide* in die andere *Wonne* hat überall hier noch nach 1600 absolut *nicht* stattgefunden; er ist nachweisbar nur für ein so wenig in das gesprochene Deutsch gedrungene Wort wie *winnimânôth*, das offenbar erst durch die karolingische Namensreform geschaffen wurde. Gegen die These von der Berührung mit *Wonne* lassen sich auch späte Entstellungen von *wun* und *weide* in *wohn* und *weidt* oder *wund-ward* (*Grimm's Wörterbuch* a. a. o. 550) anführen, die für die unverstandene Wendung überall sonst Anlehnungen versuchen, nur grade *nicht* an *Wonne*.

Mit Braune glaube ich daher, daß wir es mit zwei Worten zu tun haben, das eine auf *winja* zurückgehend, das andere mit Schwundstufen-Vokalismus *wunja*. Gegen Braune glaube ich nicht an ihre Bedeutungs-Verschiedenheit: Das erstere war schon im Ahd. veraltet, die Schwundstufen-form aber erhielt sich in dem juristischen Terminus als *wun(ne)*, *wün(ne)*. Sie hat nichts zu tun mit einem dritten Wort *wunnia*, *wunna*, über dessen Stamm sich nichts aussagen läßt.

Neben bekannten, vornehmlich alemannischen Zeugnissen für *wun* und *wunne* ist das Eiderstedter Idiom ein neuer Zeuge aus Schleswig; womit die von Schiller-Lübben im *Mittelniederdeutschen Wörterbuch* V (1880), 789 ausgesprochene Vermutung, *wun(ne)* sei "wol nur hochdeutsch," hinfällig geworden ist.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Yale University

LA PREMIÈRE RELATION INTELLECTUELLE DE DAVID HUME EN FRANCE: UNE CONJECTURE.

L'éditeur de la Correspondance de David Hume ne jette-t-il pas un peu vite, comme on dit, "le manche après la cognée," quand il mentionne l'abbé Pluche comme le Français important que l'aveide

Ecossais se proposait de voir familièrement à Reims, lors de sa première installation en France? Il se hâte d'ailleurs d'ajouter que l'auteur du *Spectacle de la Nature* avait quitté dès avant 1734 l'université et la ville de Reims, mais ajoute loyalement: "Je n'ai pas d'autre nom de rechange."¹

Reprenons les termes des deux lettres connues par lesquelles, le 12 septembre 1734, notre voyageur (qui ne fait d'ailleurs qu'une faible allusion à l'université rémoise) mentionne les recommandations qui lui rendent agréables ses premiers contacts avec deux familles (pour commencer) dans une ville où le souvenir des Ecossais Colbert ouvrait sans doute bien des portes à un jeune compatriote de ces immigrés d'antan:

These letters I got from the Chevalier Ramsay . . . I have another letter from him, which I have not yet delivered because the gentleman is not in town, tho' he will return in a few days. He is a man of considerable note, and as the Chevalier told me, one of the most learned in France. I promise myself abundance of pleasure from his conversation. I must likewise add, that he has a fine library, so that we shall have all advantages for study.

Avouons que si l'historiographie britannique s'était décidée à faire enfin un sort à cet immense sujet, *les Menées stuartiennes au XVIII^e siècle*, rien ne serait plus aisé que de prendre texte des relations existant entre Bolingbroke, Stairs, Ramsay (né en Ayrshire, et décidément converti) pour préciser la part prise par ces trois personnages—tous mentionnés tôt ou tard parmi les références initiales de David—dans les "directives" données à un jeune homme désireux de frapper aux meilleures portes en un pays qu'il avait, à tous égards, à *découvrir*. Mais on peut dire que cette sorte de triangulation conduit inévitablement à un Rémois de marque: Louis-Jean Lévesque de Pouilly.

C'est à cet esprit distingué—le métaphysicien que Bolingbroke se piquait d'avoir découvert en même temps que Voltaire "le

¹ *The Letters of David Hume*, edited by J. Y. T. Greig. Oxford, 1932. I, 19, n. 3. La première suggestion vient de l'éditeur de 1846, J. H. Burton. Dans la biographie de Hume (London, 1931), p. 39, Greig s'était déjà posé la question, dont l'importance ne lui échappait nullement, surtout étant donné que le séjour de son personnage à Reims était évalué à *un an*, et que l'impression qu'il avait faite, à son passage à Paris, sur son bienveillant mais critique introducteur le Chevalier Ramsay était sa faiblesse en métaphysique et le manque d'une "base solide" dans son esprit.

poète"— que le noble exilé, vers 1720, avait adressé les lettres en français que devait recueillir, mises en anglais, l'édition des *Œuvres* de Bolingbroke de 1754 (tome III) ; c'est à lui que cette débordante personnalité avait pu dire : "You lead me first, in my retreat, to abstract philosophical reasoning." Et son mariage avec une Française de premier ordre avait plutôt renforcé une estime² dont il était naturel que l'on fût à faire éprouver les bienfaits à l'apprenti philosophe qui souhaitait si vivement tirer le meilleur parti de son séjour en France. Qu'était, de fait, l'abbé Pluche avec ses nomenclatures dévotieuses, à côté d'un homme à qui, de plus, les plus pratiques vertus administratives et civiques étaient reconnues, et qui, membre de l'Académie des Inscriptions, y avait publié de ces "doutes" sur l'histoire comme les éprouvaient précisément les esprits sincères de cette époque?

Lévesque de Pouilly, né en 1691, n'était guère plus rapproché d'âge que Pluche—né en 1688—pour une intimité constante avec Hume, qui est de 1711. Par surcroît, nommé en 1727 lieutenant-général du Présidial de Reims, Lévesque résidait de préférence à la campagne : ce qui explique qu'à un moment voisin des vendanges de 1734, Hume semble déçu de ne point trouver "en ville" un homme qui l'attirait, intellectuellement, à bon droit. Il n'est pas sûr que le jeune Ecossais de vingt-trois ans, quittant le logis de "M. Mesier au Perroquet Vert," ait pu s'installer tout près du maître espéré, ou même chez lui, comme il y avait peut-être compté, pour une docte utilisation de la riche bibliothèque et de son excellent propriétaire. Mais puisque Hume passe un an à Reims, avant d'aller à La Flèche sous les auspices, dirons-nous, de René Descartes, un apprentissage inévitable résulte d'une fréquentation sur laquelle on voudrait être complètement renseigné.³

L'innéité ou l'acquisition des idées, la sécurité de tel ou tel

² Cf. mon article sur Lady Bolingbroke dans la *Revue de Paris*, 15 septembre 1930 et dans *Études d'Histoire littéraire*, 3e série. Il va de soi que si, plus tard, Hume se montre fort dédaigneux pour la métaphysique trop "mondaine" de Bolingbroke, un avis ou une recommandation de cet homme d'Etat, en 1734, n'avait rien pour lui déplaire.

³ Les *Travaux de l'Académie de Reims* se sont à trois reprises occupés de l'enfant notable de la ville (1845, 1878, 1900), mais le point de vue philosophique n'est pas supposé dominant dans ces études d'érudition locale. Voy. aussi F. Baldensperger, "Voltaire anglophile avant son séjour en Angleterre." *RLC*, IX (1929), 42.

témoignage sur le monde extérieur, la part des sentiments affectifs dans l'élaboration de tout système intellectuel: ce sont là des problèmes qui, impliqués plus ou moins directement dans le *Treatise of human Nature* de 1739, étaient de l'ordre le plus familier à Lévêque de Pouilly: sa *Théorie des Sentiments agréables*, résidu assez partiel d'un effort métaphysique important et de méditations commencées par une des premières explications françaises des *Principes* de Newton, devait paraître d'abord à Bruxelles en 1736, avant d'être rééditée un petit nombre de fois.⁴ Sans doute une discussion orale des points envisagés y ajoutait-elle ce que les contemporains attribuaient au Rémois, et ce que le Chevalier Ramsay trouvait déficient chez l'Ecossois entrevu à Paris au passage: la souplesse dialectique et le sens métaphysique. Mais que l'année passée à Reims dans cet encourageant voisinage ait eu son importance, voilà qui ne semble pas douteux.

"First at Reims, but chiefly at La Flèche in Anjou, I composed my *Treatise of human Nature*": c'est ainsi que l'autobiographie "situe" la composition de sa première grande œuvre; ce serait donc à nos amis du *Journal of the History of Ideas* à vérifier si la genèse, à défaut de la rédaction, n'a pas quelque obligation à un "métaphysicien" trop oublié d'une France de transition.

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

The University of California at Los Angeles

AN EARLY MANUSCRIPT TRANSLATION OF ROUSSEAU'S SECOND DISCOURS

It was not until the summer of 1763 that Rousseau's revolutionary *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* (1755) became, according to Boswell, a "fashionable topick" in England; but evidence has been presented elsewhere that English readers felt its impact almost immediately after its original publication. One specific reference before 1756 establishes, for instance, the possibility

⁴ "Où l'on établit les principes de la morale" est le sous-titre un peu ambitieux de l'une de ces rééditions, publiée trois ans avant la mort de l'auteur en 1750.

(strengthened by other evidence, mostly internal) that the irony of Burke's *Vindication of Natural Society* (1756) was directed at the *Discours* as well as at Bolingbroke; and three other references toward the end of the decade of the fifties support the notion that Dr. Johnson had the *Discours* in mind when he burlesqued in *Rasselas* (1759) prevalent ideas of the state of nature.¹

Thus, peculiar interest is attached to further indication that the *Discours* found readers in England before the appearance of the translation in January, 1762. This has recently come to light in the shape of a finely-wrought manuscript translation of the *Discours*, now in the Yale University Library, by John Farrington, of Clapham. The translation, dated 1756, differs from the version of 1762, published by the Dodsleys, and apparently never found its way into print. It is written in Farrington's own hand² and is complete with Dedication, Preface, and Notes.

In 1860, a correspondent to *Notes and Queries*³ wrote of a quarto manuscript in his possession entitled *Critical and Moral Dissertations on divers Passages of Scripture, collected and translated from Forreign [sic] Journals*. By John Farrington of Clapham; and asked "who was this John Farrington." But aside from a meagre note on the date of Farrington's death, the editor was of little help; and subsequent readers of *Notes and Queries* have added nothing. Indeed, so little is known about Farrington that the outlines of his career, how he came by the *Discours* or what led him to translate it, must be conjectured from only a few scattered bits of information.

We know, at least, that Farrington lived in Clapham, near London, was known as an "eminent merchant,"⁴ and died there

¹ The reception of the *Discours* in England has been considered by James H. Warner, "The Reaction in Eighteenth-Century England to Rousseau's Second *Discours*," *PMLA*, XLVII (1933), 478 ff.; and in my article, "Rousseau's Second Discourse in England from 1755 to 1762," *PQ*, XVII (1938), 97-114, where the early references (by Adam Smith, Benjamin Stillingfleet, William Kenrick, and Oliver Goldsmith) to the *Discours*, as well as its possible bearing upon Burke's *Vindication* and Johnson's *Rasselas*, are discussed in detail. For Boswell's comment on the *Discours* as a "fashionable topick" see *Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill-Powell, I, 439 (July 20, 1763).

² I am indebted for this information to Mr. C. A. Stonehill, who in 1934 purchased Farrington's literary remains *en bloc*. For a description of some of these, see his catalogue No 125 (1934), items 58 and 59.

³ Second Series, IX (March 3, 1860), 163.

⁴ He is so described in a one-line obituary notice in *London Mag.*, XXIX (1760), 324.

in 1760 at the age of seventy-six. Apparently he busied himself with various intellectual avocations, scientific and literary, among which was an interest in foreign literature and in the work of translation. But only one of his undertakings, it seems, resulted in publication. This was a translation of Abbé Vertot's *L'origine de la grandeur de la cour de Rome*, published by the Dodsleys on November 25, 1754.⁵ Perhaps this success led him to translate the *Discours* a year or so later. But whether the Dodsleys were dissatisfied with the result, or considered Rousseau at that time too obscure an author to warrant the risk, they did not venture a translation of the *Discours* until *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) had established Rousseau's fame beyond question.

We can only conclude that Farrington was one of the wealthy London merchants established at Clapham (a town "much frequented by Nonconformists from the middle of the 17th century onwards"⁶), the fathers of the later group of philanthropists and evangelicals known as The Clapham Sect. Apparently he was distinguished from his immediate circle only by his literary proclivities, which led him, perhaps more by chance than design, to become the first translator into English of one of the most provocative essays of the last half of the century.

RICHARD B. SEWALL

Yale University

POE, CRITIC OF VOLTAIRE

In August, 1836, Poe's "Pinakidia" was published in the *Southern Literary Messenger*. In this collection of facts and notations appears the following statement:

In Voltaire's scruples about unity of place he has committed a thousand blunders. In the *Mort de César* the scene is in the capitol, but the people seem not to know their precise situation. On one occasion Caesar exclaims, "Courons au Capitole!"¹

⁵ See Ralph Straus, *Robert Dodsley* (London and New York, 1910), 352. The publication was noted in *Gent. Mag.*, XXIV (Dec. 1754), 582; and in *London Mag.*, XXIII (Nov. 1754), 526.

⁶ Cassell's *Gazetteer of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1895), II, 35.

¹ In *The Complete Works of Edgar Allen Poe*, ed. James A. Harrison (New York n. d.), XIV, 63.

Poe makes the same accusation in *The Broadway Journal* a few years later, this time not only against Voltaire but against European drama in general. Here he says:

It would sometime puzzle an European stage hero in no little degree to tell an audience where he has arrived. Most of them seem to have a very imperfect conception of their whereabouts. In the *Mort de César*, for example, Voltaire makes his populace rush to and fro exclaiming, "Courons au Capitole!" Poor fellows—they are in the capitol all the time;—in his scruples about unity of place, the author has never once let them out of it.²

These statements show one obvious variation. Is it Caesar or the populace who "exclaims," "Courons au Capitole?" As a matter of fact, it is neither. The half-line, used only once in the play, is part of a speech by Cassius in the fourth scene of Voltaire's second act. And it is not an exclamation but, on the contrary, a rather dignified suggestion. Poe was certainly trusting to his memory, as he so often did when making quotations.³

A more important error, however, is the accusation concerning the unity of place. It is true that Voltaire says that the scene of *la Mort de César* is "à Rome, au Capitole," and nothing more; but Poe's conception of what is meant by "Capitole" is wrong. Voltaire, like many others before him, including the Romans themselves, used the word with a double meaning.

The French *Capitole*—from which the English word *capitol* is taken—was derived from, and means the same thing as the Latin *Capitolium*. The Capitolium was originally the south promontory of the double-summitted Capitoline Hill. On the Capitolium was the chief building of all Rome, the Temple of Jupiter. The northern promontory of the hill, known as the Arx, supported the famous citadel. By the end of the period of the republic, the importance of the citadel had decreased to such an extent that the word Capitolium was used to designate the entire hill, that is, both summits. Correspondingly, since the Temple of Jupiter was the most important edifice of Rome and therefore the most important part of the entire Hill, it too came to be known as the Capitolium.⁴

² *Ibid.*, xvi, 68.

³ Cf. James A. Harris, "Introduction" to Poe's *Essays and Miscellanies*, in *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, xiv, vi, for corroboration of this statement.

⁴ Cf. any authority on the topography and buildings of Rome, but especially Samuel Ball Platner, *The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome* (Boston, 1911).

Voltaire was familiar with this double use of the word. In the first part of the fourth scene of Act II, Casca narrates to Brutus and Cassius the story of how Caesar refused the crown proffered by Antony. According to Casca, the refusal took place at the Temple of Jupiter, some distance away, for he says:

César était au temple, et cette fière idole
Semblait être le dieu qui tonne au Capitole.⁵

Later Casca tells us that when Caesar had finished refusing Antony's offer, "Il sort du Capitole avec un front sévère."⁶

In these lines, Casca, standing at some distance from the Temple of Jupiter, speaks of that temple as the Capitol. It is this same temple, then, to which Cassius is referring a few lines farther on when he suggests to the little band of conspirators, "Courons au Capitole."

As for the real setting of *La Mort de César*, one can infer from the facts presented that it is somewhere on the hill called the "Capitole," not far from the temple called the "Capitole." Apparently the scene is somewhat similar to that of *Brutus*, a play written by Voltaire only a few years earlier. Here, the action takes place on the Tarpeian Rock, in front of the Temple, and one can see that imposing structure in the background.

PERCY G. ADAMS

The University of Texas

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF ERNEST RENAN

The late E. P. Dargan mentioned in his study on Anatole France a letter from Renan to France that is to be found in the Manuscript Room of the Bibliothèque Nationale.¹ When working there in 1937 on some problems relating to Anatole France, I had occasion to copy the letter. As a result of some correspondence I had with Dargan on this matter before his death, I feel that it would be of interest to publish the document, for it does indicate to some extent the relationship between Renan and Anatole France.

The fact that Renan influenced France is well established, al-

⁵ Lines 4-5.

⁶ Line 37.

¹ *Anatole France, 1844-1896* (New York, 1937), "Appendix E," 620 ff.

though a full study on the matter would be most welcome. A related problem is that of determining how well France came to know the author of *La Vie de Jésus*. Le Goff reported that France said at one time, "J'ai bien connu Renan."² When Ségur asked him, "Vous avez beaucoup connu Renan?" the reply was, "On ne connaissait pas Renan, il était trop poli, absent. Pourtant je l'ai vu souvent."³

Renan and France first met in 1886 at the home of Madame Aubernon, and Dargan thought that Anatole "imbibed something of that 'characteristic inconsequence'" either from the *conversazioni* held there or from Renan himself.⁴ The two met frequently at Madame de Caillavet's later.⁵

Barrès wrote, "France est fait de Voltaire, Renan, et Gautier (ou Gérard de Nerval, c'est le même groupe)."⁶ France was not the historian that Renan showed himself to be, but Anatole tried to ape his master's genial ways.⁷ On the other hand, Barrès said, "Il [France] est choqué du côté rondouillard de Renan, et que Renan ait dit 'Voltaire suffit, roué est de trop.'"⁸

There is much evidence in Anatole's writings of the influence of Renan. It is apparent in his style.⁹ Certain tirades and some of the Biblical language in *Thais* may be traced to Renan.¹⁰ The similarities between Renan's *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (1883) and France's *Le Livre de mon ami* (1885)¹¹ are easily seen. The character of Renan is perhaps meant to be glimpsed in the neophyte Firmin Piédagnel in *L'Orme du mail* (1896).¹² Renan's account of his three weeks in Sicily appears to have given rise to

² *Anatole France à la Béchellerie. Propos et souvenirs, 1914-1924* (Paris, 1924), 75.

³ Ségur, Nicolas *Conversations avec Anatole France* (Paris, 1925), 123. Dargan says that Anatole France was sometimes referred to as 'Mlle Renan.' (*Op. cit.*, 620.) Woodbridge reports too that Barrès had been called 'Mlle Renan.' (*MLN*, XL (Jan. 1925), 15.)

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 225.

⁵ Renan, *Correspondance*, II (1928), 329.

⁶ *Mes Cahiers 1909-1911*, VIII (Paris, 1934), 269.

⁷ Dargan, *op. cit.*, 374.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, 1904-1906, IV (Paris, 1931), 269. Ségur reports that Anatole France was pushed into historical studies by Renan, who had little use for literature (*Op. cit.*, 123.)

⁹ Doumic, R. *RDM* (Dec. 15, 1896), 924-934.

¹⁰ Dargan, *op. cit.*, 450.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 256, 294.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

part of *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* (1881),¹³ while sincere tribute to Renan is evidenced in the writing of France's *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc* (1908), "whose method imitates that of the author of the *Vie de Jésus*."¹⁴

In a folio in the Bibliothèque Nationale¹⁵ there are interesting notes indicating the genesis of "Gallion," the story which constitutes the second chapter of *Sur la pierre blanche* (1905). I propose to present these notes fully in a later study, but I might remark in the present connection that France listed there five or six borrowings from Renan.¹⁶

Renan's letter to Anatole France, dated December 28, 1891, constitutes further proof of the warm feeling that existed between the two writers:

Paris, 28 décembre, 1891

Oh! la jolie lettre, cher ami! Ma femme et moi, nous en avons été ravis. Qu'on est heureux de se voir si bien compris, si indulgemment aimé! Il faudra qu'en cette année 1892 vous veniez nous voir en Bretagne. Je vous montrerai combien vous avez raison, combien la couche du christianisme est mince, combien le paganisme naturaliste est là, vivant, seul vivant. Nous ferons des courses avec Luzel [?];¹⁷ nous irons voir les villages perdus où il y a des restes de populations pré-celtiques. Vous viendrez sûrement. Croyez, en attendant, à la grande joie que vous nous avez causée ce soir. Vous avez été notre apparition de Noël. Nous vous avons lu avec attendrissement.

Votre bien bon ami

E. Renan

Et votre Lamia. Quel petit chef-d'œuvre! Je crois que c'est ce que vous avez écrit de plus profond. La fin surtout est admirable.¹⁸

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 294 and note 8

¹⁵ *Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises* #10805, Folio 46.

¹⁶ One of the main influences from Renan is evidenced in France's many (and varying) remarks on science. From time to time he pays tribute to Renan's *L'Avenir de la science* (written in 1848, but not published until 1890); see, for example "Discours prononcé à l'inauguration de la statue d'Ernest Renan, à Tréguier, le 13 septembre 1903," *Vers les Temps meilleurs*, II (Paris, 1906), 33-57; or Ségur, *Dernières Conversations avec Anatole France* (Paris, 1927), 18 ff. and 160 ff. For France's own ideas on science, see Mornet, "M. Anatole France et la science," *Revue du mois* (July 10, 1911), 60-76; and Craig, "Anatole France and the Development of His Ideas concerning Science," *The Modern Language Forum*, XXII (Dec., 1937), 200-213.

¹⁷ Renan's handwriting is difficult to read at this point; the proper name may read either "Luzel" or "Suzel."

¹⁸ *Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises* #10805, Folio 40.

Anatole France did not reach Renan's home in Brittany, for unhappily Renan died in October of the following year.

By "Lamia" Renan referred to the main character in *Le Procureur de Judée*. Lamia talked with his friend Pontius Pilate years after the crucifixion of Christ, and the last line of the dialogue revealed the fact that Pilate, at the end of a long and eventful career, had completely forgotten the Jew named Jesus. Professor Woodbridge pointed out some time ago that Anatole France undoubtedly got the idea for the story from Renan's "Les Apôtres," the second volume of the *Origines du Christianisme*.¹⁹

Anatole's story first appeared in *Le Temps* on December 25, 1891, as the "Conte pour le jour de Noël." Later in the following year it was republished in France's *L'Etui de nacre*, a collection of his tales. It is interesting to note that Renan termed the story a little masterpiece, a correct estimate from one who professed to dislike literary matters.

Renan naturally agreed with France's approach in the story, perhaps not realizing the extent of his influence on the versatile Anatole. But should we go so far as to say, as does Professor Chevalier, that without Renan Anatole France is inconceivable?²⁰ The question is indeed still open to debate.

HORACE S. CRAIG, JR.

University of California, Los Angeles

KLEIST'S "ERFINDUNG"

"Hier tritt Shakespeare einzig hervor, indem er das Alte und Neue auf eine uberschwengliche Weise verbindet," says Goethe, speaking of the contrast "Antik" and "Modern."¹

As Shakespeare had done instinctively, so Schiller did intentionally; since *Don Carlos*, certainly since *Wallenstein*, he tried to combine the dramatics of the Ancients and the Moderns, of Sophocles and Shakespeare.

¹⁹ "The Original Inspiration of *Le Procureur de Judée*," *MLN*, **xI**, (Dec. 1925), 483-485.

²⁰ *The Ironic Temper: Anatole France and His Time* (New York, 1932).

¹ Goethe, *Shakespeare und kein Ende*, II.

Kleist would have attempted nothing new, had he tried to fuse Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Shakespeare. Actually, the often repeated assertion that such was Kleist's endeavor is only a misunderstanding of Wieland's letter to Dr. Wedekind (4/10/1804). Wieland only says that the beginning of *Gnuskard* impressed him as such a synthesis, not that Kleist was striving after such a synthesis.²

The mysterious "Erfindung" of Kleist has been interpreted in a more definite way by Julius Peterson,³ perhaps in a too definite way when he assumes that Kleist anticipated "Richard Wagners Technik des musikalischen Erinnerungsmotivs." But the more general interpretation, "daß Dynamik, Führung und Aufbau des Ganzen durch musikalische Gesetze bestimmt werden sollen," is the most plausible suggestion advanced for this problem.

That in the same year (1803) when Kleist wrote of his "Erfindung," Holderlin seems to have been occupied with very similar reflections does not simplify the problem:

Es wird gut sein . wenn man die Poesie . zur *mechane* der Alten erhebt. Auch andern Kunstwerken fehlt, mit den griechischen verglichen, die Zuverlässigkeit, wenigstens sind sie bis jetzt mehr nach den Eindrücken beurteilt worden, die sie machen, als nach ihrem gesetzlichen Kalkül und sonstiger Verfahrensart, wodurch das Schöne hervorgebracht wird. Der modernen Poesie fehlt es aber besonders an der Schule und am Handwerksmäßigen, daß nämlich ihre Verfahrensart berechnet . . . und wenn sie gelernt ist, immer zuverlässig wiederholt werden kann.⁴

Holderlin wrote this as a note to *Oedipus Rex*, and coincidentally, "from June 18 to July 15, 1803, Kleist borrowed a translation of *Oedipus Rex* from the Dresden Library."⁵

I do not venture to infer more than that Kleist's "Erfindung" was also a *mechane*, a *technique*. That it was a musical technique is not contradicted by any of the following statements, while it is almost asserted by the last, inclusive statement covering all the others:

(10/10/1801) "Ich habe mir . . . in einsamer Stunde ein Ideal ausgearbeitet . . ."

² Cp "To Kleist is attributed as a deliberate aim what he has nowhere said of himself and only Wieland once stated as his private opinion." W. Silz, "On *Homburg* and the Death of Kleist," *Monatshefte* (1940), 325.

³ J. Petersen, "Kleist's dramatische Kunst," *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1921, p. 15.

⁴ Hölderlin, Anmerkungen zu seiner Übertragung des "Ödipus" (*Werke*, im Tempelverlag, III, 191).

⁵ J. C. Blankenagel, *The Dramas of H. v. Kleist* (1931), 70.

(7/3/1803) " . . bis ich eine gewisse Entdeckung im Gebiete der Kunst . . . völlig sicher gestellt habe."

(10/5/1803) "Denn in der Reihe der menschlichen Erfindungen ist diejenige, die ich gedacht habe, unfehlbar ein Glied"

(Juli 1805^o) "Ja er hat die ganze Finesse, die den Dichter ausmächt, und kann auch das sagen, was er nicht sagt."

(2/14/1808) "Doch in der Kunst kommt es überall auf die Form an."

(August^o, 1811) "Ich betrachte diese Kunst . . . als die algebraische Formel aller übrigen, und . . . so habe ich von meiner frühesten Jugend an alles Allgemeine, was ich über die Dichtkunst gedacht habe, auf Tone bezogen. Ich glaube, daß im Generalbaß die wichtigsten Aufschlüsse über die Dichtkunst enthalten sind."

The most cautious assumption would be that "Generalbaß" is to be taken in the widest sense. *Concise Oxford Dictionary*: "thorough-bass . . . hence, theory of harmony." "thorough-bass . . . (loosely) harmonic composition."

The next step towards determining Kleist's musical composition is done by contrasting his plays with others, especially Schiller's. The key drama, *Guiskard*, is a fragment. One must operate with the working hypothesis that *Penthesilea* comes next to the intended structure of *Guiskard*. "Ich habe eine Tragödie (Sie wissen, wie ich mich damit gequält habe) von der Brust herunter gehustet. . . . In Kurzem soll auch der Robert Guiskard folgen; und ich überlasse es Ihnen mir alsdann zu sagen, welches von beiden besser sei; denn ich weiss es nicht" (to Wieland, 12/17/1807). On the other hand, there is an obvious resemblance in form between the tragedy, *Penthesilea*, and the comedy, *Der Zerbrochene Krug*. The two dramas (and the fragment, as far as it goes) have an uninterrupted action; they arrive at a quick climax; the middle of the drama is calm and lyrical; the last third of the drama is violent movement (not for the eye, but through the ear for the mind's eye). A tentative conclusion would be, therefore, that Kleist's "Erfindung" was the application to dramatics of a basic musical form: the usual succession Allegretto-Adagio-Presto of the classical sonata, the concerto, and the original symphony.

(Even for the repetition of scenes in *Homburg*, there is no need to look toward Wagner. Every movement of a "regular" sonata or symphony ends with the re-statement of the initial theme.)

NORBERT FURST

St. Louis, Mo

^o To Pfuel, *Werke*, ed. E. Schmidt, v, 321.

BEOWULF AND GRENDEL'S MOTHER

、 TWO MINOR PARALLELS FROM FOLKLORE

The two Polynesian folktales summarized below contain several details conspicuously close to incidents in the tale of Beowulf's fight with Grendel's mother in the submarine *hrofsele*. The tales have not been used in any discussion of the *Beowulf* poem and they deserve at least passing attention from students of the OE epic. They may provide some additional material for the professional folklorist, in whose hands surely lies what study is still to be made upon the supernatural and fabulous elements of the poem. The two tales are retold from the account by Johannes C. Andersen, *Myths and Legends of the Polynesians* (London, 1928), pp. 139 ff. and 263 ff. respectively.

1. *Pitaka and Peke-haua* (Maori).—Maori traditions contain several stories involving the destruction of a man-eating monster (*taniwha*) which has caused terror by its ravages. The tale of Pitaka is especially close to the Grendel incidents in *Beowulf*. A fierce *taniwha* was causing havoc in the Rotorua district (North Island, New Zealand), until a band of 170 warriors gathered, set on its destruction; bravely they marched to its haunt and ingeniously snared it with ropes. Reports of a second *taniwha*, named Peke-haua, now reached these victorious heroes, and they at once marched on to its lair. This was a deep water-hole called Te Warouri at Te Awa-hou in the district of Waikato and Pa-telere. The warriors constructed water-traps of basket-work pattern, and elected one of their number, Pitaka, "a fearless and courageous man," to descend into the chasm and ensnare the evil monster. Pitaka took up a large stone and with some comrades dived into the water-hole with the snare; the others stayed round the edge reciting various charms and spells to arrest the monster's powers. Pitaka reached the floor of the chasm and was able to coax and then ensnare the *taniwha*, which was already much pacified by the charms and spells. So hero, monster, snare and all were safely hauled to the surface. The slain monster's belly when cut open was found to contain a quantity of jewels, armor and clothing.

2. *Aiai' and the Eel* (Hawaiian).—In this legend Ku-ula the Hawaiian god of fishermen and his wife, goddess of fishes, made their abode on the island of Maui, one of the Hawaiian group.

Their son was the hero Aiai-a-Ku-ula. A giant eel named Koonā (in other versions Tuna) came to dwell nearby, in the ocean-cave Kapukaulua, intending to prey upon the fish-pond of Ku-ula. Its depredations were disastrous; and Ku-ula entrusted to his son the task of destroying the plunderer. Aiai' put out to sea and when he found in the water signs of the eel's lair below, took a stone and dived to the bottom. There he found an ocean-cave around the entrance to which swam many deep-sea fishes. Reaching into the cave he was able to hook the eel and be pulled safely to the surface again; he returned to the shore towing the dead ravager.

These two slight tales, collected from widespread parts of the Polynesian world, are close enough in details to suggest the existence of many other legends about heroes who engage in reckless submarine contest against some vague but fearsome monster. There is no involved mythological consideration to disentangle in them: it is obvious that the monsters were no more than large predatory sea-animals, some species of giant lizard or possibly an alligator in the first tale, and a giant eel in the second. No such forthright explanation would suffice for the Grendel race in the *Beowulf* epic. But the basic incident in all three is suggestively close: a brave hero elects to undergo a fierce struggle with an awesome monster which lurks in some dim lair far below the water's surface; from this the hero emerges victorious, bringing away in token of his prowess the dead creature (or some part of it: the head of Grendel in *Beowulf*). Pitaka's willingness to undertake a second contest with monsters is an obvious further parallel to the conduct of the hero Beowulf.

L. WHITBREAD

University of London

G. H. CALVERT'S TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GERMAN

George Henry Calvert (1803-1889) ¹ is credited in B. Q. Morgan, *A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation* ² with a translation of Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans* (Nos. 8012 and 8013), as well as of *Don Carlos* (No. 8077) and of the

¹ For accounts of Calvert's life see the *Dictionary of American Biography* and E. A. and G. L. Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature*, II, 372.

² Second edition, Stanford University Press, 1938.

Correspondence between Goethe and Schiller (No. 3034). Calvert's *Maid of Orleans* is, however, an original poetic drama,³ first printed privately in Cambridge (Mass.) at the Riverside Press in 1873, and published with some changes in the following year by Putnam in New York. In making the character and story of Joan of Arc a vehicle for noble sentiments, Calvert does indeed follow in the footsteps of Schiller rather than Voltaire, but in details of plot, characters, and language, his *Maid* is independent of *Die Jungfrau*. His *Don Carlos*, on the other hand, is a translation of Schiller which has the fault of all too close adherence to German idiom.

A few short or fragmentary translations by Calvert are not listed by Morgan. In *A Volume from the Life of Herbert Barclay* (Baltimore, 1833) are to be found (pp. 167 ff.) some "Translations from Goethe's *Faust*": "Prologue in Heaven, Hymn of Angels," and "From the Garden Scene." The verses from the Garden Scene are *Faust's* famous credo (Part I, lines 3433-3459). According to an accompanying note, "both of these translations were published in this country in the year 1830," but the place of earlier publication is not indicated. Somewhat revised, these translations reappeared in Calvert's *Miscellany of Verse and Prose* (Baltimore, 1840) along with "From Schiller: The German Muse," a translation of *Die deutsche Muse*. Finally, the passages from *Faust*, again revised, appeared together with several new ones in *Goethe: His Life and Works* (Boston and New York, 1872),⁴ The last named work also contains many translated quotations from Goethe's letters, diaries, and conversations, as well as translations of *Der untreue Knabe* (pp. 101-102), *Wandrer's Nachtlied I* (p. 149), *Gefunden* (p. 186), *Parabel*⁵ (pp. 194-195), and *Der Gott und die Bajadere* (pp. 271-273).⁶ Stanza xxiii of Calvert's *Cabro, a Poem, Cantos I and II* (Baltimore, 1840) is a translation of Schiller's *Kolumbus*. In

³ Not to be confused with his narrative poem, *Joan of Arc*, privately printed in 1860 and published in Boston, 1883. See the *Catalogue of books in the Redwood Library bequeathed to the institution by George Henry Calvert, to which is prefixed a bibliography of Mr. Calvert's works* (Newport, R. I., printed for the Library, 1900).

⁴ Morgan, *Bibliography*, No. 2432.

⁵ Weimar ed., III, 173.

⁶ These translations of lyrics do not fall within the chronological limits of the study by Lucretia Van Tuyl Simmons, *Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation Prior to 1860*, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 6 (Madison, 1919).

Charlotte von Stein a Memoir (Boston, 1877) there are copious extracts from Goethe's letters, and again (p. 200) the translation of *Gefunden*.

C. W. HAGGE

University of California at Los Angeles

KENELM DIGBY'S "THUSCAN VIRGIL"

Sir Kenelm Digby, in his *Observations upon Religio Medici* (sixth ed., 1685, p. 100), writes:

It is Love only that can give us *Heaven* upon Earth, as well as in Heaven; and bringeth us thither too So that the *Thuscan Virgil* had reason to say,

—In alte dolcezze
Non si puo gioir, se non amando.

And this love must be employed upon the noblest and highest object; not terminated in our friends . . .

Misled perhaps by the general tone of the context, Toynbee (*Dante in English Literature*, I, 134) comments that "the 'Thuscan Virgil' can hardly be other than Dante, but the passage quoted does not occur in Dante's works." Farinelli (*Dante in Spagna, Francia, Inghilterra, Germania*, 1922, p. 289) suspects that the Italian quotation does not exactly fit the context, but cannot identify it. He remarks:

Boccaccessa è in sostanza la citazione capricciosa, vagamente suggerita al Digby, se io non erro, da una sentenza di Dafne nell' "Aminta" del Tasso (II atto: "Che sol amando, uom sa che sia diletto") . . . E Tasso [sic for Tirsi] parla, a sua volta, delle "dolcezze d'amore."

Farinelli's intuition is at least partially justified, but an intermediary formulated the quotation in question. By "Thuscan" Digby seems to have meant merely a writer in Italian, and by "Virgil" an author of bucolic verse; his lines come neither from Dante nor Tasso, but from Guarini's *Pastor Fido* (V, 8 near end), where Ergasto says, in no neo-platonic accents, to Corisca:

Vo diritto diritto
A trovarmi una sposa,
Chè 'n sì alte dolcezze
Non si può ben gioir, se non amando.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

REVIEWS

The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Edited by F. W. BATESON. 4 vols. New York: Macmillan and Cambridge University Press, 1941. Pp. xl + 912; xx + 1003, xxii + 1098; iv + 287. \$32.50.

Bibliography is a vital necessity to scholarship, recording its accomplishments and affording a sound and clearly defined base for progress. Each year its scope, intensity, and need increase, what was adequate yesterday proves insufficient today. In 1916 the bibliographies at the end of the chapters of *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, if not entirely satisfactory, were most useful and scholars have leaned heavily on them. Eight or more years ago, however, the need of something better began to be keenly felt, and the plan of *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* was conceived—at first merely as an effort to bring the original lists up to date, but soon expanded to construct an entirely new work far more comprehensive than any thing of the kind hitherto attempted. In the words of Mr. Bateson, the editor, his task was “to record as far as possible in chronological order, the authors, titles and editions, with relevant critical matter, of all the writings in book-form (whether in English or Latin) that can still be said to possess some literary interest, by natives of what is now the British Empire up to the year 1900.”

More than 200 scholars of international standing have compiled the work in three volumes of over 3000 double-columned pages with a fourth volume of 287 pages as an index. Basically, as it should be, the work is chronological in that Vol. I covers A. D. 600-1660; Vol. II, 1660-1800; and Vol. III, 1800-1900. Within each of these periods is subdivided topically, e. g., Vol. III contains the following subdivisions: 1. Introduction, 2. Poetry, 3. Prose Fiction, 4. Drama, 5. Critical and Miscellaneous Prose, 6. Philosophy, History, Science and Other Forms of Learning, 7. Literature of the Dominions. With the exception of the first and last of these divisions, each is again divided chronologically into Early Nineteenth-Century, Mid-Nineteenth-Century, and Late Nineteenth-Century. In fact the division and classification in the work are carried to such an extreme as to be sometimes confusing. To use the work successfully, one must know exactly what he wants and then study the table of contents and index (not too helpful) closely. Even then he may miss much that he needs, for although most books have a major interest by which they are classified, they also have many important minor interests which may be in demand. Fewer subdivisions might cause the user of the Bibliography

to search through more items, but he might be amply repaid by finding more to his purpose. The topical arrangement within the major chronological divisions puts the temporal sequence sadly but not inconveniently out of joint. For instance, all the Jacobean and Caroline poets, including Milton, appear before Shakespeare; all the later Eighteenth-Century poets, before Bunyan; and Swinburne, before Maria Edgeworth.

The scope of the Bibliography is vast and coincides with the broadest possible definition of philology as the interpretation of literature by all fields of intellectual endeavor that can possibly give any assistance. Each year the bibliographers of special periods of literature are dipping more widely and deeply into collateral fields. The *CBEL* has gone far in the same direction, but not far enough; it may satisfy the specialist in its range but not in intensity which has no limitations short of completeness. Space will not permit the mere mention of all the related fields of study covered by *CBEL*. A few examples must suffice: book production and distribution, education, social background, history, philosophy, science, other forms of learning, travel, scholars, literary relations with the continent, newspapers and magazines, law, classical, Biblical, and oriental scholarship, etc. It is quite obvious that this work will be useful to students of branches of learning other than English literature. In the words of the Preface "no type of printed book, from the chapbook to the scientific treatise, from the collection of hymns to the gift book, from the school boy's 'crib' to the treatise on whist, has been altogether neglected."

The entries in *CBEL* are not of the kind to satisfy the professional bibliographer, who delights in reproducing the title-page exactly with all the details and peculiar features of a volume that enable the user of his bibliography to identify another copy of the work described if it is rare or likely to be forged. Some attempt has been made to reproduce the wording and spelling of the title-pages of the first editions, as also the original punctuation and capitalization of the older and more important books, but for the most part titles have been modernized and abbreviated. There is no attempt to name the publisher or give the size of the work. After the title only the date and sometimes the place of publication are given. The aim of the editor appears to have been to refer the reader to the greatest amount of material in the briefest manner. In many cases the user must still do a smart bit of hunting before locating his quarry.

Something of the thoroughness, proportion or lack of it in the work may be exhibited by listing the more important authors with the number of pages allotted to each: Shakespeare, 68; Chaucer, 41; Byron, 25; Dickens, 20; Defoe, 19; Swift, 15; S. Johnson, 15; Goldsmith, 14; Dryden, 13; Scott, 12; Pope, 11; Milton, 10; Coleridge, 8; Wordsworth, 7; Shelley, 6; Browning, 6; Keats, 4;

Spenser, 3. Aside from the first two, rank and merit has had very little to do with the figures. Popularity, as in the case of Byron and Goldsmith, has played a part, but much has depended on the diligence, thoroughness, and degree of selectivity employed by the individual bibliographer. From 1700 to 1800, 222 minor poets are listed with a total of 67 pages. In the same period 89 minor dramatists receive 36 pages. From 1800 to 1900, 320 minor poets receive 98 pages, and 203 minor writers of fiction occupy 106 pages. If these figures indicate nothing else they show plainly that the calm of oblivion has been much ruffled. From these lists many a graduate student will take a suggestion and endeavor to make the dead and forgotten live again.

In evaluating *CBEL*, the specialist looks at sections dealing with authors with whom he is particularly familiar and may thus judge the quality of the whole work on too narrow a basis. The present reviewer considers Byron and Coleridge well handled, but is disappointed with the treatment of Wordsworth, Browning, Southey, Thomas Moore, Spenser, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and the minor Jacobean dramatists. The attention paid to Australian, New Zealand, and Canadian literature is perfunctory. On the other hand some of the more general sections give us a broader view and a better basis of judging the work as a whole. The sections devoted to "Book Production and Distribution" and "Newspapers and Magazines" in the different periods are exceptionally good; the one on "Poetical Miscellanies, 1660-1800" cannot be praised too highly.

As might be expected much responsibility is frequently shifted to other bibliographies where they exist to lend aid, saving space but not the user's time and convenience. For instance, in the section devoted to Middle English Literature one is obliged to rely to a large extent on the previous excellent bibliographical work of J. E. Wells, A. H. Billings, L. A. Hibbard, and others. In passing we note what appears to be some lapses in this section, otherwise how explain the omission under Chaucer of Caxton's first edition of *The Canterbury Tales*, also of Wynkyn de Worde's, and the inclusion of Tyrwhitt's great edition only in the section on "Early Criticism and Scholarship"?

The acid test of *CBEL*, in accuracy of particulars can come only with long and careful use. In a rather casual manner the writer has noted some omissions that seem to him important, as for example: the early poem of Thomas Middleton, *The Ghost of Lucrece* (1600—rediscovered in 1920); under Magazines and Newspapers, *The Literary Phoenix*, Birmingham, 1829; J. Sheridan Knowles' *Alfred the Great; or, The Patriot King, an Historical Play*, 1831; C. S. Northup's article, "King Arthur, the Christ, and Some Others" in *Studies in Philology* in honor of Frederick Klaeber, Minneapolis, 1929; L. C. Karpinski's *History of*

Arithmetic, Chicago, 1925; L. N. Broughton's *The Wordsworth Collection* (an extensive bibliography), Ithaca, 1931, L. N. Broughton's *Wordsworth and Reed* (containing 22 letters by Wordsworth), Ithaca, 1933.

Minor slips and typographical errors are numerous. In I, 8, col. 2, *for* J. T. Dredge *read* J. I. Dredge; in I, 726, col. 2, *for* J. H. Wilson *read* H. Wilson; in I, 893, col. 1, John Ferguson's *Bibliographical Notes*, etc. was published in 1899 and not in 1897; in II, 87, col. 1, under Edwards, F. A. *for* July 4 *read* July 14 and add to the item several more references to *N. & Q.*, in II, 966, col. 1, *for* A. K. Anderson *read* A. R. Anderson; in III, 553, col. 2, *instead of* Yeats, W. B., "The Later Works of Fiona Macleod" *read* Macleod, F., "The Later Works of W. B. Yeats."

The first three volumes of *CBEL*, we are informed, were finished in 1936, 1937, 1938 respectively, and it is evident that some contributors handed in their assignments still earlier. The completion of the Index and the publication of the entire work have been delayed by the war, thus the work was out of date before it appeared. The Index is quite inadequate for the complicated work it represents and should be revised and much enlarged in the near future. "As to the future," remarks the editor, "the *Annual Bibliography of English Literature* . . . will provide most valuable material for supplements to the *CBEL*. to be issued at suitable intervals." Alas! the Annual Bibliography is at a standstill with no way for its continuance in sight.

With all of its faults, and they are not a few, *CBEL*. is a monumental work and an absolutely necessary tool for every scholar in our language and literature.

L. N. BROUGHTON

Cornell University

Wortindex zu Goethes Faust. By A. R. HOHLFELD, Emeritus Professor of German, University of Wisconsin; MARTIN JOOS, Lecturer in German, University of Toronto; W. F. TWADDELL, Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Department of German. The University of Wisconsin, Madison. Copyright, 1940.

The editors call this work "erste Gesamtschau des Wortschatzes eines grossen deutschen Literaturwerkes unserer Zeit" (p. viii). It is to serve primarily linguistic purposes, especially linguistic statistics. The reader expects to find a complete collection of all the words in Goethe's *Faust*, but in spite of the statement just quoted and in spite of the title he is told that this is not the intention of the editors. They state in the preface: "Da unser

Wortindex die luckenlos zahlenmassige Übersicht bieten soll über das gesamte Wortmaterial eines in sich geschlossenen Werkes als eines einheitlichen sprachlichen Ablaufs, so schliesst diese Rücksicht wiederum alles aus, was nicht zum eigentlichen Text gehört, also die Namen der jeweils sprechenden Personen, Überschriften, Bühnenanweisungen, Varianten u. s. w." How the omission of words in the stage directions, titles and names can be reconciled with the assertion that this is a "Gesamtschau des Wortschatzes" of *Faust* is difficult to understand.

According to the editors the stage directions, titles and names do not belong "zum eigentlichen Text," but what would Goethe's *Faust* look like if it were edited with the omission of all stage directions, titles and names? To ask the question is to answer it. Such a *Faust* would cease to be "ein in sich geschlossenes Werk." It is a wholly unjustifiable view of stage directions, titles and names to assume that they can be separated from the rest of the drama. They are not accidental but form an organic part of every drama and nowhere more so than in Goethe's *Faust*, where much would remain obscure without stage directions, titles and names.

What is "ein einheitlicher sprachlicher Ablauf," a uniform or coherent linguistic flow and where does it originate? It cannot refer to the speeches of the *dramatis personae*, for the speeches of Gretchen, Helena, the witches and the Emperor are not connected with one another and are not uniform, "einheitlich," nor do they originate with these characters who are merely the creations of the poet's imagination. The source of this linguistic flow is Goethe and all uniformity and coherence are due to Goethe. But the stage directions, the titles and many names of the dramatic characters also emanate from Goethe and belong to the linguistic flow of the drama, i. e. of Goethe. Every part of the drama is a part of the linguistic flow emanating from Goethe. An index of words in *Faust* which differentiates between parts of the linguistic flow of the drama by excluding all words found only in the stage directions, titles or names can, by no stretch of the imagination, be called "Gesamtschau des Wortschatzes," *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust*. The title is a misnomer raising false hopes. To be in keeping with the facts, the title should have been "Wortindex zu Zueignung, den metrischen Zeilen und der Prosaszene in Goethe's Faust," clearly an impossible title, as it would seriously detract from the interest in the work.

In this connection the editors have been guilty of a strange inconsistency. They include in their Index the words of the *Zueignung*, implying thereby that it is a part of the "eigentliche Text" of the drama. But if any part of the drama can be dispensed with, it is this poem. It has no connection whatsoever with the drama or the action. It merely expresses Goethe's personal feelings and experiences while he was working on *Faust*. It is a super-imposed ornament, not a necessity. On the other hand, stage directions,

titles and names which form an organic and necessary part of the drama are non-existent so far as the *Wortindex* is concerned.

It must be a matter of great regret to every one interested in *Faust*, linguist or literary critic, that the adoption of a wholly arbitrary and indefensible method has prevented the editors from accomplishing what they had set out to do. The performance falls short of the promise. It is all the more regrettable as within the limits set by the editors for themselves the work has been done with the utmost care and thoroughness and is deserving of the highest praise. It seems to be as perfect as a work of this kind can be made perfect. So far as I can see, not one word has been omitted found in that part of the poem upon which the Index is based. I have noticed only one minor misprint, *Turkei* instead of *Turker* on p. 131.

In reading over the stage directions, titles and names of Part I, I have found at least a hundred words which are not recorded in the Index, among them such characteristic words as Prolog 243, Heerscharen 243, Erzengel 350, gotisch 354, 6566, Makrokosmos 430, Erdgeist 460, unwillig 460, 522, Meerkatze 2337, 2532, Sternblume 3179, Spinnrad 3374, Zwinger 3587, Blumenkrug 3587, Mater dolorosa 3587, Walpurgisnachtstraum 4223, daherbrausen 4399, verhallend 4612.

We have a right to expect these words in a book that purports to give a "Gesamtschau des Wortschatzes" of Goethe's *Faust*. Erdgeist, Makrokosmos, Meerkatze are words intimately connected with the drama, Zwinger in the sense used in l. 3587 is obsolete in modern German, the commentators have to explain it, but the *Faust* passage has kept the word alive. One is tempted to ask: what is the use of a *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust* if we cannot find some of the most characteristic words?

Equally unfortunate are the results in connection with Part II. I have a list of over 220 words found in the stage directions, titles and names not recorded in the Index. I can give only a few of the most characteristic ones: Schlafsuchend 4613, Pfalz 4728, Theorbe 5158, 78, Naturdichter 5295, Nacht- und Grabdichter 5299, Attitude 6293, Souffleurloch 6399, Explosion 6564, 9442, hingestreckt 6566, Farfarellen 6592, gemutlich 6770, Rollstuhl 6772, Parterre 6772, 6815, Laboratorium 6819, phantastisch 6819, 9127, Ad Spectatores 7003, 10210/327, 11286, Luftfahrer 7040, Allgesang 8217, bauchrednerisch 8227, Signal 9442, Felsensteile 9574 (the word has evidently been coined by Goethe, the *DWb* gives one other example from Goethe's works), aufflammen 9808, felsauf 9819, Lichtschweif 9901, Aureole 9903, Exuvien 9955, Platte 10039 (different in meaning from Platte in l. 2154, where *Platte* is used in the sense of *Glatze*, not *Tonsur*, as the Index states, Siebel is not a priest but a student, cf. *DWb*. s. v. Platte 11), Siebenmeilenstiefel 10067, auftappen 10067, Sprachrohr 11143, erblinden 11499, phantastisch-flügelmännisch 11636, Dick-

teufel 11656, Durrteufel 11670 Unsterbliches 11825, 11934, Bergschluchten 11844, anbetend 12096.

More than 320 words are lacking in the *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust*.

The *Wortindex* omits the names of the "jewels sprechenden Personen." No one will object to the omission of names like Faust, Gretchen and some others, but there are many speakers that have no personal names. They are allegories or personifications or they represent groups of people. In the scene *Vor dem Tor* we have Handwerksbursche, Dienstmädchen, Schuler, Bürgermädchen, Burger, Bettler, Soldaten. These common nouns are not recorded unless they are also found in a metrical line. In the *Walpurgisnacht* we have Halbhexe, General, Parvenu, Autor, Trodelhexe, Prokto-phantasmist, Servibilis, all of which go unrecorded. To put these names, which are really descriptive nouns, in the same class as regular proper names is altogether mechanical. A name applied to an individual does not eo ipso become a proper name. To omit such words takes away from the wealth and variety of words used by Goethe in his *Faust*. There are many similar names in Part II.

The *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust* does not perform what the title promises, but that does not mean that it is of little value. It is of great value, fragmentary though it is, and we must be grateful to the editors for their labor, industry and devotion. But it will always remain a matter of keen regret that the learning of the editors did not guard them against being led astray by a wrong theory which has prevented them from giving us the perfect *Wortindex zu Goethes Faust* for the making of which they had every qualification.

JOHN A. WALZ

Harvard University

A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne. By HOMER CARROLL COMBS and ZAY RUSK SULLENS. Chicago: Packard and Company, 1940. Pp. x + 418. \$7.50.

Mr. Combs had finished his manuscript for a Concordance of Donne before he heard of Mrs. Sullens' manuscript. This book represents a check of the two efforts against each other by Mr. Combs. Work was proceeding in the year 1933 on another Concordance of Donne by Whitner and Crawford; there is ground for believing that yet another was finished by Horace Williston; and I know that there is a good one, complete in manuscript, by Professor Roland B. Botting, of Pullman, Washington. The projectors of such works should advertise their projects well in advance, as Botting tried to do, in order to avoid needless waste of time and energy.

The present book will be of great use to students of Donne and other students of the English language and literature. The defects I have noted in it will not reduce its practical value. The one occurrence of *youthful* is out of alphabetical order. There should be mutual references between *yourself* and *self*; the basic text of Grierson commonly makes two words of *your selfe*, *thy selfe*, *it selfe*, etc. *Seely* and *silly* are grouped together under *silly*, though apparently Donne may use them differently. Again, there is no reason why the same line should be printed twice in succession when it contains a given word twice; on page 208, the line, "Thou, Love, by making mee love one" (52 *Will* 43), is mistakenly printed thrice. On page 210, the last reference to this word ("Physitians by their love") should doubtless be corrected to become the sole instance of *lore*; see Grierson's edition of 1912, 2. 275, Addendum; but the correction was missed for his text of 1929. Mr. Combs follows the way of my *Concordance to Wordsworth* by using *to* in the title, when *of* is better; by indicating a reference from one word or combination to another with *see*, when *See also* is better; and by taking the metrical line for quotation. This last practice does well enough with most of the lines of Donne and Wordsworth, but sometimes does harm, as in the line of Wordsworth, "His thin autumnal locks where Monks abide"; the result is better when we read: "to hide | His thin autumnal locks where Monks abide." A good many quotations from Donne could have been improved by addition and subtraction, and the extra labor would not have been great. On p. 416 there are no spaces ("leads") between the quotations under W, X, and Y, and no cap. X or cap. Y. Z (p. 418) is duly marked. The black-faced list of Words Omitted or Only Illustrated (p. vi) is printed in a fount too small, the same fount being used for "guide-words" (? "head-words") throughout the Concordance proper, where it functions well enough; the two preceding hyphens are mine. "Hyphenated" is a better term than "hyphenated" (p. vi), and there are not hyphens enough in the Preface. "Repetitious" is a word not liked by those who keep an eye on style.

Homer is mentioned by Donne in his English poems, and so is Lucan; Virgil is not, nor Lucretius, Horace, Chaucer, Shakespeare, or Spenser. Cicero's daughter appears as *Tullias* (but Mr. Combs' "guide"-word has a little *t*). Ovid does not appear, nor "Naso"; there is no Plato, no Aristotle, unless as "Nature's Secretary, the Philosopher" (the apostrophe is mine). Nor does the word *metaphysical* occur. Donne uses a good many geographical names and the like—"Magellan," "O my America! my new-found-land," "Guyana."

One thing a concordance shows for a poet, if he has it, is beauty of sound; the strong, emphatic Donne seems to lack melody in his lines as we read them aloud from the Concordance, his ear apparently not being keen for long and short syllables in English.

When so many persons are willing to index the poets, they should

be urged to do the work for an early rather than a late poet, and for a greater poet rather than a less. Even students of English would now do well to make such books for important authors of great ages in countries other than England, for the French poets, say, and the German; Mrs. Joseph E. Moody (Wolf Pit Road, Westport, Conn.) once undertook a work of the sort for the *Chanson de Roland*; or they should help Professor Deferrari of the Catholic University in Washington with his concordances of Latin poets. There are, in fact, not many English poets left, perhaps none of sufficient importance, for the growing tribe of concordance-makers. Some badly-needed volumes are still in manuscript. Professor Edwin J. Howard, of Oxford, Ohio, has a great deal done on a work of this kind for the body of Old English poetry; he already had a nucleus of slips some years ago for the signed poems of Cynewulf. Professor Coolidge Otis Chapman, of Tacoma, Washington, has long had a complete Concordance in manuscript of the four Middle English poems attributed to the author of *Pearl*; this ought long since to have been published, and it is not Mr. Chapman's fault that it never has been issued; I highly recommend it to Messrs. Packard and Company, who in a short time have as far-sighted publishers done much for the advancement of scholarship in the field of "English."

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

A Concordance to the Poems of A. E. Housman. Compiled and edited by CLYDE KENNETH HYDER. Lawrence, Kansas, 1940. Pp. vii + 133. [Planographed.] \$3.50.

A Bibliography of Alfred Edward Housman. Compiled by THEODORE G. EHRSAM. Boston: F. W. Faxon Company, 1941. Pp. 44. \$1.25. (Useful Reference Series, No. 66.)

Although Professor Hyder has done a careful job, the necessity of a Housman concordance is questionable for four reasons: the corpus of Housman's poetry is extremely small; Housman is a minor poet and too recent; the edition of his *Collected Poems* does not indicate the many variants and is not an established text; and, indeed, some of Housman is still uncollected. The author covers the verses in the *Collected Poems* (though he errs in accepting the readings of the unreliable Knopf *More Poems*), and the lighter verse in Laurence Housman's *My Brother, A. E. Housman* and in *Alfred Edward Housman: Recollections*. He also includes a word-list for "Fragment of a Greek Tragedy," but uses the *Yale Review* version, which contains two errors. Minor omissions are two *Shropshire Lad* variant lines (xxxviii, 10; lii, 9) and the uncollected bits in Laurence Housman's memoir (p. 76), in the *Recollections* (p. 17), in the London

Times (November 9, 1936, p. 13), and in Percy Withers's *A Buried Life* (p. 66). Far more serious is the omission of the comic verses in *Three Poems* (University College, London, 1935). Despite this, the *Concordance* will be an aid to the student of Housman's vocabulary and his use of metaphor and simile.

Mr. Ehrsam's book is an incomplete and inaccurate check-list with bibliographical pretensions. He attempts to supplement A. S. F. Gow's list (*A. E. Housman A Sketch*, pp. 65-80), and does add (1) some items published since 1936, (2) first American editions, but with inaccurate data and no collations, (3) a bare few of many reprintings, and (4) a long but incomplete list of reviews and Housmaniana. This bibliography, however, is characterized more by what it omits than by what it includes. Nor is Mr. Ehrsam entirely familiar with material he handles. Thus, for "privately printed issues" he directs the reader to John Carter's article in the *Colophon*, where only two such "issues" are noted. One of these (*Introductory Lecture*) Mr. Ehrsam himself lists, and one other (*Three Poems*). But he misses six more: *Address to Sir J. G. Frazer*, *Address of Condolence*, *Jubilee Address*, "For My Funeral," and two noted by Gow (p. 80). Only one appearance in a periodical ("Fragment of a Greek Tragedy") is given, nothing whatever being said of other material in magazines,¹ books, and anthologies, nor are uncollected writings and MSS. mentioned. Off-prints of Housman's classical studies are neglected except for a single listing. The vast list of authorized and unauthorized *Shropshire Lads* published in America and England is overlooked. Arbitrarily ignoring newspaper articles, Mr. Ehrsam misses some 60 items (many important) in the London *Times* and New York papers. Failure to record changes between American and English editions and to give correct first publication data betrays carelessness: Laurence Housman's *Unexpected Years*, for instance, was first issued by Bobbs-Merrill, 1936, not Cape, 1937. And of more than 50 musical settings, only Vaughan Williams's is listed.

The only *raison d'être* for this book is that it presents the longest list of reviews and biographical-critical material yet published. However, so awkwardly are the reviews arranged that the use of them is difficult; and the 235 critical articles are fewer than half of those published. While the bibliography will be useless to collectors, it will be helpful to students in spite of its faults. But its principal value is to point the need for a definitive Housman bibliography.

WILLIAM WHITE

Whitman College

¹ For a list of these first appearances, see an article published after Mr. Ehrsam's volume went to press: John Carter and John Sparrow, "A. E. Housman, An Annotated Check-List," *The Library*, 4th ser., **xxi** (September, 1940), 160-91.

Paradise Lost An Account of Its Growth and Major Origins, with a Discussion of Milton's Use of Sources and Literary Patterns.
By GRANT MCCOLLEY. Chicago. Packard and Company, 1940.
Pp. xix + 362. \$2.50.

This book is a significant contribution to our growing recognition of Milton's debt to, and place in, the Christian tradition. Following Robbins and Taylor, Mr. McColley brings out—with a wealth of detail hitherto unattained—Milton's knowledge of the Hexameral tradition, and then passes to an excellent analysis of the growth of *Paradise Lost* from the Trinity College drafts onward, a new and ingenious chronology for the composition of the poem, and a summary entitled "Interpretations and Conclusions."

Despite its virtues—and there are many which we have not mentioned—Mr. McColley's book contains two serious weaknesses. The first is the unorthodox chronology of *Paradise Lost*. Rejecting the traditional dates (1655-63), he prefers to exclude the years 1658-60, and to assign the whole of Book VI and parts of Books IV, V, VIII to 1652-53; I-III and parts of IV and V to 1655-58; and the remainder of the epic to 1660-63. 1652-53, however, seems less suitable for "relatively uninterrupted work" on the epic than Mr. McColley would have us believe (p. 308).¹ The context of *P. L.*, IV, 124-30 does not indicate that the passage is necessarily an interpolation (p. 321). Nothing in *P. L.*, VII, 23-35 shows that it could have been written only in 1660 (pp. 300-1). And finally, Mr. McColley seems all too arbitrary in his treatment of Milton's contemporary biographers.² Such matters lead us to believe that Mr. McColley's new chronology is, as he suggests (p. 309), "overly radical" and "forced."

The second and far more serious fault is Mr. McColley's disregard of the *De doctrina*, which he mentions apparently only twice and dismisses as a "digest chiefly from the works" of Ames and Wolleb (p. 337). Having thus ignored the theology, which constitutes the "great" and basic argument of *Paradise Lost*, he easily trips on detail,³ omits to give any account of the most immediate

¹ For instance Milton became blind during this period. Mr. McColley would date the blindness in 1651, but the firmness and certainty with which Milton signed the Arnold Album on November 19, 1651, completely belies Mr. McColley's contention. During the seventeen months between December 1651 and April 1653, moreover, Milton's mass of diplomatic work exceeded that done in the preceding two years and nine months (Masson, IV, 427, 486).

² Particularly questionable seem Mr. McColley's disregard of the anonymous biographer and his dismissal of Aubrey's notes as "secondary" and "obviously confused" (p. 307). The anonymous biographer apparently had first-hand knowledge of Milton's literary activities between 1655-58, and entries in the Bodleian MS by both Mrs. Milton and Edward Phillips indicate that Aubrey went to some pains to verify his information.

³ For instance, Mr. McColley misinterprets *P. L.*, III, 173-202 (pp. 205-

"major origin" of the poem, and is consequently in no position to discuss adequately the more general, but extremely significant, theme of Milton's Christian heritage.

For Mr. McColley, it turns out, the Christian tradition or paradox appears to be synonymous with the "vast body of religious literature which Christendom had slowly accumulated for sixteen centuries" (p. 2); but for scholarly purposes we must distinguish with Troeltsch between the central Christian tradition of the Churches and the religion of the Sects and other groups, and between important and unimportant presentations of each case. It serves little purpose to cite the names of eleven theological writers in alphabetical order to show Milton's orthodoxy on the *Imago Dei*. It is merely confusing to be informed that Milton's views on the goodness of God in creation would be "equally attractive to Christians of all creeds" (p. 48). For those who recognise the Christian paradox as anything more than an amorphous mass of opinion, the phrase "Christians of all creeds" is a contradiction in terms. It may be true that in this instance none of the Churches or Sects would quarrel with Milton's position; but that is because one and the same view of the Creator's activity is common to them. Instead of quoting Damascene, Heywood, Kolleb, and More as background for the goodness of God in creation, Mr. McColley would have been happier to compare the "put not forth my goodness" passage with the Biblical view of creation, the belief of the creeds, the standard utterances of Augustine, Thomas, and Calvin. Surely, too, it was necessary to pass behind what Milton and these authorities say on the activity of God to the fundamental question of what they say on the nature of God; but this subject is not even broached.

It would be ungenerous to stress these typical short-comings in a book of real value and scholarship. Within its limits the book is excellent and meets a real need. Yet the author does fail to fulfill one of his principal claims, to give us an adequate picture of the Christian and philosophic setting of Milton's thought, of that "ancient and powerful tradition which gave birth to *Paradise Lost*" and of which Hexameral literature is only a manifestation. Such a task, however, may be beyond the power of any one man living today, for it would require mastery of the Milton Corpus and the Biblical-theological tradition alike.

Princeton University
Hobart College

MAURICE KELLEY
T. S. K. SCOTT-CRAIG

07), mistakenly connects the Spirit present at creation with Matt. iii, 16 (p. 51), and finds an impropriety, where none exists, in the two announcements of the exaltation of the Son (p. 211).

Bishop Butler, Moralism and Divine. By WILLIAM J. NORTON, JR.
New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1940. Pp. xi +
336. \$3.75. (Rutgers University Studies in Philosophy, 1.)

Bishop Butler looms large in eighteenth-century English thought. Mr. William J. Norton, Jr., now devotes a sizable volume to the comprehensive examination of Butler's writings in the attempt to reconstruct his ethical, metaphysical, cosmological, social, political, and religious systems. Butler himself never having put any of these into definitive form, Mr. Norton's study is directed toward the "interpretation of Butler's philosophy as a whole, viewed internally" (p. x).

Doubtless this synthetic aim is admirable; but the "internal view" needs to be supplemented, tested, and corrected by the "external view," including the intellectual climate and the political and social backgrounds. This Mr. Norton has not done. The only writers of the Age of Reason cited in his bibliography are Hobbes, Locke, and Wollaston, of whom only the last is actually quoted at first-hand, though, to be sure, the names of Clarke, Descartes, Hutcheson, Leibniz, Shaftesbury, and Wesley receive passing mention. In 1936 the bicentenary of the publication of the *Analogy of Religion* elicited at least one full volume and a dozen or more articles; the latest study of Butler mentioned, however, is of 1930. This scholarly deficiency is not simply lack of documentation but lies much deeper in a deliberate disregard of historical values.

Yet without these correctives, Mr. Norton's methodology is bound to lead to occasional dubious conclusions. The section on Butler's social and political philosophy may serve to illustrate the weaknesses of strict textualism. After "a painstaking search guided by a degree of conjecture" [p. 144], Mr. Norton concludes that: (1) "Butler is a proponent and defender of the divine right of kings" [p. 158]; and (2) "Butler refuses to believe in the right of rebellion or revolution" [p. 162]. To attribute such unequivocal sentiments to a Whig bishop who always voted with the Walpole administration is dangerous. Believing that government is moral by nature, Butler finds in all of its forms manifestations of the divine will. The democracy of a tiny Swiss canton is as true an instance as the limited monarchy of George II, an elected national official or an appointed local constable as an hereditary king. To confuse this broad moral sanction of all government with the narrowly political *divine right of kings* is suicidal of all meaning. Again, government being fundamentally moral to Butler, even a bad government is preferable to none and, therefore, revolution with its consequent temporary suspension of government is "not to be thought of without horror." Yet Butler nowhere expressly declares that revolution is never expedient, which is a very different proposition indeed and, in view of the "Glorious Revolution," one not apt to be held by a Protestant Whig in public position.

However useful this volume may prove to the professional philosopher or moralist, it is not likely to interest the historian of thought or of ideas because of the author's insistence upon what he calls "the fact that in their essential thought" Butler's writings "are so little a product of their times" [p. 9]. Nor is Mr. Norton's prolix and cumbersome dissertation style likely to please the historian or critic of fine letters. *Bishop Butler, Moralist and Divine*, despite the title, is not really concerned with Butler the man, nor yet with Butler the thinker in so far as he derived from and, in turn, affected his age, but solely with the thought of Butler as interpreted by the writer from the viewpoint of the twentieth century. If the twentieth century rather than the eighteenth was Mr. Norton's chief interest, it would certainly have been less confusing to the historian and it might conceivably have been more useful to the metaphysician and moralist had he omitted altogether the framework of Butler's works. It is, therefore, to be hoped that he will sometime salvage the many materials of value from his pseudo-historical excursion into the eighteenth century and present his own conception of a modern Protestant philosophy.

ERNEST C. MOSSNER

Syracuse University

The Good Lord Lyttelton. A Study in Eighteenth Century Politics and Culture. By ROSE MARY DAVIS. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Times Publishing Company, 1939. Pp. ix + 443.

This is an industrious and heavily documented biography of George Lyttelton, one of the most unexciting figures in his age; and it is really nothing more. The subtitle is a complete misnomer: there is no study of eighteenth-century politics or culture; merely an endless succession of petty fact and swelling quotation, from which, in Johnsonian phrase, "the attention naturally retires." Lost in the four hundred pages of diffuse narrative are some "contributions to knowledge," and some corrections of error, the results of Miss Davis's reference to MS. material; and for these we are duly grateful. The deficiencies of the book are largely explicable by our lack of precision in defining the requirements of a doctoral dissertation in literature. To demand—or at least to encourage—"contribution to knowledge" is sound. But far more emphasis should be thrown than is commonly the case on an effort of synthesis. To such an effort, no doubt, lipservice is paid—sufficient to dictate subtitles, but not radically to alter the character of books. Lyttelton, relatively unimportant in himself, is a characteristic figure in eighteenth-century politics, society and letters, and what is more significant, is a type of the *honnête homme* (English variety)

passing into "the man of feeling." How do his life and writings illustrate these facts, and in so doing illustrate the temper and the tastes of the century's middle years? If we can answer these questions when we lay Miss Davis's volume aside, it is either because we knew the answers already or because we have laboriously pieced them together from her indiscriminate quotations.

Nowhere is Lyttelton more interesting than in his relations with other writers (especially with Thomson), and to this subject Miss Davis pays a good deal of attention. Especially we are glad to have (as Appendix A) an account of Lyttelton's posthumous revision of Thomson's *Seasons*, based on a transcript of emendations, preserved in the British Museum, the original interleaved copy of the *Works* (1750) having perished at Hagley in 1925. Other appendices print verses and letters hitherto unpublished, and in the text (pp. 301-2) we find an interesting unpublished letter from Boswell. There is a very useful check list of the various editions of Lyttelton's published writings, of works of doubtful authorship, and of those erroneously ascribed to him, followed by twelve pages of reference works used in compiling the biography.

The mechanics of the book are far from satisfactory. Dr. Johnson tells us in his inimitable way that the third edition of Lyttelton's *History of Henry II* appeared with "what the world had hardly seen before, a list of errors in nineteen pages." Miss Davis's volume lacks such embellishment; nor is it our purpose to supply the defect. Half a dozen instances will suffice. In the bibliography we encounter Professor Elizabeth Mainwaring and the *Life and Political Works* of James Woodhouse; and we read of Basil William's *Life* (p. 88), of protégés (p. 128), of Field marshal Sir Robert Rich (p. 141). Such slips make us uneasy about the more numerous examples of some one's error occurring in the quotations. Did Lyttelton find the world marked by a "tendency to perfection" (p. 297), and write It for Its in his verses (p. 142), and talk about "by own health" (p. 129), and "they wretched world" (p. 97), and did the *Gazetteer* spell *Iliad* with a double l (p. 57), and did Wilkes write "store" for "stole" and complete the nonsense by leaving out the period at the end of the line (p. 279)? Not less deplorable is the occasional failure to accommodate the grammar of the sentence to the quotation which is embedded in it (p. 79), or the sacrifice of sense to a thoughtless accuracy of transcription (if indeed accurate it be) where sentences are made to end with a semicolon or colon or with no punctuation at all, and where one gets such meaningless records as a comma, three dots, and a comma (pp. 273, 79, 281).

A. S. P. WOODHOUSE

University of Toronto

John Gay, Favorite of the Wits. By WILLIAM HENRY IRVING.
Durham, North Carolina Duke University Press, 1940. Pp.
xii + 334. \$3.50.

In his preface, Mr. Irving reminds us that "although the Augustans are again in fashion, so far no adequate life of John Gay has appeared." He has therefore added to his earlier study, *John Gay's London*, an admirable biography of the fat, genial, lazy bard. Although Gay was the favorite of the Wits, he has been no favorite with biographers. His life was uneventful. He was no favorite with the statesmen and politicians of Augustan London and therefore had no political career as did most of his literary contemporaries. He was the pampered darling of great ladies; yet there is no suspicion of a love affair, and in the only incident where it is hinted that Gay toyed with the idea of marriage he was such a laggard that Swift called him the "silliest lover in Christendom." Furthermore, there are no literary quarrels to add spice to the story of this amiable poet's life. Mr. Irving concludes that Gay lacked the energy that would have made him really ambitious.

The biographer of Gay is handicapped by lack of abundant material. "He was," Mr. Irving says, "from the biographer's point of view, most disobliging. He kept no diary, he wrote no autobiography, he neither preserved nor revised his letters. He was utterly careless about signing his name to essays and poems." Mr. Irving has drawn from newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, theatrical records, and the minor writings of the eighteenth century to produce a biography that is thorough, scholarly, and well-documented. Despite the author's pleasant, easy style, the interest lags at times because of the inclusion of material that slows the tempo of the narrative.

The first part of the introductory chapter gives a pleasing account of life in Devonshire in the closing years of the seventeenth century. Here, where his forebears had for generations been county people of some consequence, Gay was to the manner born. Here he received a good education at the Barnstaple Grammar School. Less successful is the second part of this chapter, which deals with the barren years of Gay's life, from 1708 to 1711. The contributions of his colleagues on the staff of *The British Apollo* are discussed, but just what he contributed, either of verse or prose, to that periodical is not made clear. Any account of the life of Gay gains interest when it reaches his friendship with Pope, who was attracted by his "good nature and ingenuity." From this time on, Gay found direction for his genius, and the twenty year association with Pope was the supreme achievement of his life.

In all Gay's poems there is none perfect—the parts are better than the whole, a fact which makes selection from his works difficult. Mr. Irving perhaps gives too high praise to the songs, but

such partiality is natural in so enthusiastic a biographer. Parts of *The Shepherd's Week* and of *Trivia*, the *Journey to Exeter*, the *Epistle to a Lady on her Passion for Old China*, Mr. Pope's *Welcome from Greece*, *The Beggar's Opera*, and a few songs from other plays are no mean output. They still delight us. Perhaps, after all, John Gay thrived on pampering.

CHARLES KENNETH EYES

College of the City of New York

John and William Bartram, Botanists and Explorers; 1699-1777, 1739-1823. By ERNEST EARNEST. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940. Pp. vii + 187. \$2.00.

Crèvecoeur's *American Farmer* began the myth that John Bartram's interest in flowers developed miraculously in a mature man (p. 15), whereas Bartram himself says (*ibid.*) that he "had always, since ten years old, a great inclination to plants." Franklin (p. 25) concurs. William Bartram (pp. 15-16) leads us to believe that the first step his father took towards scientific botany was connected with a practical rustic interest in surgery and medicine. As an amateur student of herbal remedies, John surely did seek help from a neighboring schoolmaster, who taught him Latin and the technical names of plants.

Others in the region about Philadelphia had formed botanic gardens before John began his; note the German mystics led by Kelpius, and two successive gardens started by Christopher Witt. Mr. Earnest does not mention the yet earlier gardens of South America, among which no doubt we must include collections of medicinal plants made by the Incas, who also caught and kept wild animals.

The lives of John and William Bartram centred in their garden, which still remains near the heart of what is now greater Philadelphia. Here their friends and acquaintances, as Franklin, Jefferson, Crèvecoeur, and even Washington, came to visit the philosophical botanists and their plants. Washington, a wealthy landholder at Mount Vernon, seems to have been disappointed in the crowded five or six acres on the Schuylkill. The travels of both John and William also had their centre in the garden and the stone house made by John's own hands. Here too they received distinguished visitors, including men of science, from Great Britain and the Continent. Too bad the present volume lacks a plan or picture of the house and grounds. The cuts of father and son are most engaging.

There are far too many points of interest in Mr. Earnest's care-

ful, valuable, well-made book to let us touch on all of them in a short review. Doubtless a few words should be added on the literary relations of the Bartrams. There is some evidence that one or both were influenced by the writings of Sir Isaac Newton; that they both fought French eighteenth-century atheism, and accepted something from a theism of the same nation; and that, like many other Friends, they read the narrative poems of Milton. How these gardeners must have reveled in Book Four of *Paradise Lost*!

For their influence, and especially that of William, on English and other European writers, Mr. Earnest has duly recorded the findings of source-hunters thus far, and has discovered some parallels for himself. He is, however, mistaken in thinking (p. 132) that Coleridge was more likely to have noted a given book of travels before Wordsworth saw it than the other way round.

There is an ugly term, "Foreword," at the opening of the book, instead of "Preface"; too bad Lewis Carroll did not cure our language at this point in advance. For "prior to" (p. 69) and "lengthy" (p. 141), say "before" and "long." Or shall the purists give in, and say "widthy" for "wide," "strengthy" for "strong," and so on? Further, there are needless dots before and after quotations from prose, as if we needed to be told that a quoter is not quoting a whole book. And there should be more hyphens for what really are compound words. This substantial and entertaining book is very welcome.

LANE COOPER

Charles Sackville, sixth Earl of Dorset, patron and poet of the Restoration. By BRICE HARRIS. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1940. Pp. 269. \$3.00 and \$3.50. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xxvi, 3-4.)

Professor Brice Harris's *Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset*, with its subtitle, *Poet and Patron of the Restoration*, is the first full-length biography of this noble rake, whose youthful scandalous achievements as the colleague of Rochester, Sedley, Buckingham, and even Charles himself have for many people probably overshadowed his associations with Dryden, Etherege, Congreve, Otway, Prior, and the rest, and have certainly overshadowed for everyone his own minor accomplishments in literature and statesmanship. Mr. Harris has been at work on his book for several years, as his acknowledgment of a grant-in-aid from the American Council of Learned Societies in 1934 indicates; and the signs of his industry, patience, and ingenuity in research are everywhere visible. Besides recording what seems to be every bit of printed material

about his subject, he has thoroughly combed all the pertinent collections of records and documents, and has had access to the family papers still preserved by the present Lord Sackville. All the significant material seems therefore to have been presented in this study.

Yet this is the sort of book whose great merit tends to become its chief weakness. Such a mass of quotations and details of minor consequence are likely to obscure the larger outlines of the life and the finer shadings of the character. When everything is set down as of equal importance, the result is likely to lack proportion. It is not enough to let facts speak for themselves, without synthesis. Mr. Harris himself is not unaware of the danger he has exposed himself to, for toward the end of the book he writes: "In summarizing the character of Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset, after several hundred pages of forgotten facts, one can only hope that the picture is clearer and fairer. . . . It has seemed proper, then, sometimes at the pain of full documentation and as objectively as possible, to exhibit the parade of vices and virtues which made up his life in a day-by-day account."

One regrets the more that Mr. Harris has been tempted to this easier road because at many points he gives clear indication of his ability to write good narrative and criticism. Sometimes the adoption of a less chronological presentation of events would improve the organization, as in the now rather badly scattered discussion of the two *Pompey* plays. Sometimes authors seem to be improperly grouped together, though this fault does not occur often; surely, however, it is a distortion to discuss Sackville's patronage of Thomas Shadwell in the chapter entitled "The Lesser Men of Letters" when his patronage of John Crowne is treated in "The Greater Men of Letters."

The index, which when used in conjunction with the footnotes becomes also a bibliography, is very complete and satisfactory, though there are one or two slips, such as the omission of Allardyce Nicoll, in spite of the use of Nicoll in the text and footnotes. One is also rather surprised to find that Leslie Hotson's work is not referred to in the discussion of the history of the late Restoration theater. The index, nevertheless, might well be taken as suggestive of the value of Mr. Harris's book, which should be a very useful reference work for the scholar in literature and history, but is less interesting reading than its material would have permitted.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

Northwestern University

The Brontës' Web of Childhood. By FANNIE ELIZABETH RATCHFORD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xix + 293. \$3.50.

The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë. Edited by C. W. HATFIELD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xxi + 262. \$2.80.

Nearly twenty years ago Miss Ratchford became interested in the Brontë juvenilia and began the task of studying them. Earlier publication of partial results of her work aroused great interest among Brontë scholars, who have long awaited the complete results. The present volume will more than fulfill their expectations. Two major difficulties beset anyone engaged on this quest: the wide dispersion of manuscripts and the microscopic and often illegible script in which they are written. Her perseverance and eyesight have been equal to the task, and we now have a fascinating account of their contents and significance.

Since by far the greatest number of the manuscripts are Charlotte's, it is to her that most of the book is devoted. For years she and Branwell encouraged each other in fictions concerning various characters in the imaginary land of Angria. Branwell's ideas ran almost entirely to war, revolution, and slaughter. Charlotte preferred the social scene and the creation of striking characters. Her contributions present a strange mixture of Scott and Byron. As time went on she constantly reverted to earlier portions of the narrative, writing new scenes about earlier events and even creating new earlier events to go with them. That this was also Emily's habit is proved by her poems. In Charlotte's work the existence of a large mass of material in both prose and verse has enabled Miss Ratchford to straighten out most of the difficulties; in the case of Emily the disappearance of the prose history of the Gondals has left some unsolved problems.

Next in interest to the account of Charlotte's literary relations with her brother is the section on M. Héger. Miss Ratchford believes that Charlotte's letters to him should not be interpreted as love-letters and that the sources of *Jane Eyre* and *Vallette* are to be found in the juvenilia rather than in Brussels. This is a controversial point. While it would be useless to deny in the face of the evidence that these books derive much from Charlotte's earlier writings, we can hardly be persuaded that M. Héger and his pensionnat had nothing to do with the case.

Valuable as it is, the section on Charlotte is of minor interest compared to the interpretation of Emily's poems, all of which were connected with the story of her imaginary land of Gondal. Only those who have attempted to unravel from these poems the narrative which lay behind them can appreciate the skill and patience with which Miss Ratchford has reconstructed the outlines of that epic.

Her account solves many puzzles which have confused readers of the poems and makes it possible now to see them against the proper background and to understand their meaning.

Miss Ratchford had already shown the need for a revised edition of Emily's poems based on a complete survey of the manuscripts. Luckily Mr. C. W. Hatfield, whose edition in 1923 was the first to deal with them intelligently, has now published the definitive edition. It contains the first satisfactory account we have had of the manuscripts and their locations. This catalogue shows that Emily made two careful collections of her poems in 1844, one of which contains the annotations made by her and Charlotte when preparing to publish their poems in 1846.

Collation of new manuscripts and increased acquaintance with Emily's script have produced many corrections. For instance, "The dream of A. G. A." now appears more significantly as "The death of A. G. A." Notation of the variants shows that when Charlotte published some of Emily's poems after her death she often added whole stanzas of her own as well as making relatively harmless changes in style. A number of the longer poems now appear in their complete form instead of in fragments. The best example involves two well-known passages, "The Visionary" and "The Prisoner," which are actually parts of a long narrative entitled "Julian M. and A. G. Rochelle." This heading emphasizes the point that Emily's poems must be read in the light of their Gondal setting. The new edition gives us much new evidence for this, but the interpretation must be sought in Miss Ratchford's book. We still need an explanatory index of the Gondal characters and their initials. It is worth pointing out that events in Gondal history were established by Emily with great precision. Three poems (pp. 110, 212, 217) specify the month and year, and one (p. 186) the year only.

LEICESTER BRADNER

Brown University

The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860. By HERBERT ROSS BROWN. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 407. \$3.00.

The Sentimental Novel in America presents a vivid and richly documented picture of the light reading of the general public between the years 1789 and 1860. Few absurdities of the sentimental compromise of that period escape illustration and comment by a writer who is able to maintain a sane and humorous perspective throughout: the heroine of sensibility with her ready tears and swoonings, her virtue, her piety, her faithfulness unto death (which she uniformly preferred to the divorce court however licentious or

brutal her husband), the romantic hero of sensibility, scarcely less given to tears and swooning than the heroine; the villain of seduction stories, who also acquired the appurtenances of sensibility at the moment of repentance; the sentimental backdrop with its groves and summerhouses and grottoes for the reflective moods of the heroine, its opportune moonlight and sunsets and storm clouds; the American equivalent of the Victorian home, "the appointed shrine for woman, more holy than cloister, more saintly and pure than church or altar." Of even more value in the account of the subjects about which the American public liked to read in these years are the chapters on the fictional versions of the numberless fads—Mesmerism, Phrenology, Perfectionism and the expectation of the Millennium, and what not—and those reviewing the fictional contributions to two great nineteenth-century movements, the fight for temperance and the anti-slavery (and pro-slavery) crusade.

Professor Brown's book is thus without doubt a rich and valuable store-house of information pertinent to the understanding of the American culture of the period. Pertinent to the understanding, for, although fiction of this calibre cannot in any sense be considered a representation of the society which it pretends to depict, nevertheless so thorough a review of what the public liked in the way of fiction, what kind of plots, what types of characters, what moral premises, what social formulae, what beliefs about man and his destiny, tells us something very valuable about its mind and tastes. In fact such a contribution would seem to be the *raison d'être* of this kind of a study, for as Professor Brown has clearly shown these novels can scarcely be taken seriously from the point of view of the aesthetics of the novel. Yet it is along this very line—the reflection of the popular preferences of the time and hence of the American mind—that Professor Brown might have made a more solid contribution. His book is indeed much more descriptive than analytical. It accepts the fictional scene without asking searchingly enough *how* and *why*. It too easily attributes the main features of the sentimental formula to the example of Richardson and Sterne instead of seeing that Richardson and Sterne merely gave a convenient form of expression for ideas current in a larger frame of reference. It throws out intriguing illustrations of matter to be found in the novels without seeing its significance or relating it to larger and more important movements of thought—such matter as educational principles, shifting conceptions of the moral sense, the whole cycle of ideas involved in primitivism, the rationalistic solution for the perfectibility of man. In fact so little analysis has Professor Brown given to this part of his material that he has lumped together illustrative material presenting quite distinct and often antagonistic strands of thought as if they all belonged to the same family of ideas: the revolutionary conception of perfectibility, for example, tends in his treatment of it to merge with the religious doctrine of

perfectionism on the one hand and with the idealization of the American Indian on the other. A more adequate equipment in the background of ideas would have enabled him to see significance in a great deal that he has passed over lightly and would have completed the picture for us of the interests and preferences of the less erudite American public from 1789 to 1860, a picture which he has so admirably drawn for us up to a certain point.

LOIS WHITNEY

Russell Sage College

Joseph Conrad, The Making of a Novelist. By JOHN D. GORDAN.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940.
Pp. xiv + 430. \$4.00.

Ford Maddox Ford held the opinion that in time there might come an obscuration of Conrad's fame, his contention being "that it is natural for each succeeding age to react against the masterpieces produced by the age immediately preceding it." Nevertheless, November saw the publication of two books on Conrad: *The Letters of Joseph Conrad*, edited and translated by John Archer Gee and Paul Sturm of Yale University, and *Joseph Conrad, The Making of a Novelist* by John D. Gordan of Harvard University.

The amount of patient and exhaustive research in Mr. Gordan's book is prodigious, and future students of Conrad and of English literature cannot afford to be without it. Who was this man Conrad? Mr. Gordan shows us all the facets of this inexhaustible genius, the core of his mind and soul, lofty, tender, and understanding, "one of us"—as he explained Lord Jim. This new study holds nothing back: we see a creative artist producing a succession of masterpieces, harassed by continual personal and family illnesses, the demands of editors and publishers, dunned by tradesmen and creditors. This condition was existent and constant until after the publication of *Chance* in 1914, when his place was assured. Here is a sympathetic and factual disclosure of the mind and methods of Conrad, revealing in detail his incessant search for the right word correctly to mirror his experiences and philosophy. "Give me the right word," said Conrad, "and I will move the world." The changes in text and in the titles themselves are duly set down: *The Children of the Sea*—"absurdly sweet"; then the substitution of the original title *A Tale of the Forecastle*; then—*A Tale of the Sea*, *A Tale of Ships and Men*, and finally the blunt, but particularly appropriate *The Nigger of the Narcissus*, which title that noble but lonely saga of the sailing era bears today. There are copious examples illustrating the growth of the text, a veritable encyclopedia of Conrad source material.

In the research work connected with compiling *A Conrad Memorial Library* I felt the need of a more fully documented biography than the studies by Curle, Jean-Aubry, and others, available at that time. Conrad in his Author's Notes gave us valuable clues to the genesis and background of the stories, and now Mr. Gordan in going back to the original manuscripts, corrected proofs, published and unpublished letters, has given us in a single volume all the information that the most serious student could wish for. Fortunately, the bulk of the manuscripts and other Conradiana are preserved in this country.

Well, there cannot be too many studies of the life and works of the great Pole. Ford says, "He was a great poet and an honest man. So scientifically and with precision we may deduce his immortality, and his dust may lie in its Kentish sunlight heedless of passing clouds."

GEORGE T. KEATING

Rancho Santa Fe, California

Charles Egbert Craddock (Noailles Murfree). By EDD WINFIELD PARKS. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 258. \$2.50.

Mr. Parks's book is less significant as biography or criticism than as a revealing account of the literary career of a Southern gentlewoman, Mary Noailles Murfree ("Charles Egbert Craddock"), "a gifted amateur of letters," who published her first article, "Flirts and Their Ways," in 1874 and her last, "Muscle Shoals in Colonial Days," in 1921, a year before her death at the age of seventy-two. At the beginning of her long and productive career, at the moment when an interest in local color was in the ascendant, Miss Murfree was so fortunate as to discover a vein of material—the lives of the Tennessee mountaineers—which she worked industriously for over a decade. Her first notable success was the volume of short stories assembled from the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly* and published under the title *In the Tennessee Mountains* in 1884. Her best local color novels were *The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains* (1885) and *In the "Stranger People's" Country* (1891). In 1896 she was shocked to learn that her publishers were losing interest in her repetitious use of the material most familiar to her, but, turning courageously to the working of a new vein, the American historical novel, she produced two moderate successes, *The Story of Old Fort Loudon* (1899) and *A Spectre of Power* (1903). When the vogue of this type of novel passed in its turn, she was unable to understand or to master the new modes of

naturalistic or sociological fiction, and was forced to devote her last years to hack work of no distinction.

Although Miss Murfree is a decidedly minor figure in the history of American fiction, this book about her was well worth writing. Mr. Parks's evocation of the genteel background of his heroine's life is a delightful contribution to the social history of the South. His carefully documented narrative of her imperious dealings with her indulgent publishers throws a welcome light on the status of the author in the late nineteenth century. The psychological problems connected with her personality he has refrained from treating, and the critical problems he has not been completely successful in solving. He is happiest in pointing out the values and the limitations of her work: skilful use of dialect, opulent descriptions, strongly typed recurrent characters, and repetitious plots. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether, as he asserts, she ever wrote "a distinguished novel," or that there is anything in her writing "approaching greatness." But for a careful evaluation of Miss Murfree's work on the scale of the other local color writers of the period, this attractive book will furnish the necessary foundation.

FRED B. MILLETT

Wesleyan University

Sylvester Judd (1813-1853), Novelist of Transcendentalism. By

PHILIP JUDD BROCKWAY. Orono, Maine: University Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 121. (University of Maine Studies, No. 53.)

In a curious personal essay, "Cardiagraphy," addressed to members of his own family, Sylvester Judd wrote in June, 1837:

I would yield my heart cheerfully to the dictates of reason. I cannot, I dare not demur. I reject Calvinism because it opposes my consciousness, my reason, my nature, and the Bible. . . . My soul bursts from its prison-house; it walks forth, buoyant with freedom; it treads upward toward its God.

Judd was twenty-four years old. Graduated from Yale in the previous year, he now enrolled in the Harvard Divinity School until 1840; the balance of his life of forty years he spent in Augusta, Maine, in the service of the Unitarian church. The exultant words were, presumably, typical of the feelings of many young New Englanders in 1837 who watched the withdrawal of John Calvin's black hand; who heard the free voices of Channing and Emerson.

The value of Mr. Brockway's study lies less in the recreation of Judd as a man of letters than in this depiction of his "transcendental" experience. Although Mr. Brockway naturally regrets that he cannot establish more precisely the personal associations of Judd and Emerson, the relationship gains, I think, from the fact

that Judd was not one of the circle of idealistic young men (whom Hawthorne disliked) about the seer of Concord. The influence, then, was independent of proximity; it was distance-defying, almost telepathic; and in its indelible stamp upon Judd's writings it remains one of the most memorable instances of Emerson's spiritual magnetism. The definitions of this influence and of Judd as a delicate recorder of other liberalisms of the time make Mr. Brockway's study a valuable expansion of our knowledge of "The New England Renaissance."

The portions of the book which celebrate Judd's literary performance are less fortunate, partly because Mr. Brockway is more expository than critical, but chiefly because Judd's writing, except for his suggestions of the contemporary New England mind, is indubitably minor and second-rate. The full titles of his works intimate their provincial qualities: *Margaret, A Tale of the Real and Ideal, Blight and Bloom, Including Sketches of a Place Not Before Described, Called Mons Christi* (1845); *Richard Edney and the Governor's Family* (1850), and *Philo, An Evangelist* (1850), a blank verse narrative which, says Mr. Brockway, was regarded by some contemporary readers as a "signal fire for the regeneration of the earth." More probably, these elaborately ideological works of the disciple of Emerson will throw an occasional gleam of light on that aspiring little group of thinkers who lived before the triumph of the machine.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

Hegel's Hellenic Ideal, by GLENN GRAY, King's Crown Press, New York, 1941, viii + 104 pp.

After the end of the Middle Ages Greek culture was an integral part of the intellectual culture of Western and Central Europe. It helped to build up the modern view of life in the period from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century—the new philosophy that was based on deeper insights into man's nature and on social and moral concepts freed from the rules of chivalry and church. It laid the ground work for a new society and state in the classical France of the seventeenth century. In the end it became the source of the artistic and metaphysical culture of eighteenth century Germany. The so-called Hellenic ideal of German Classicism and Romanticism and of the post-Kantian philosophy in Germany was the last outcome of this development.

Gray has tried to arrest this development just at its final point. He shows how Greek philosophy was transformed into a new mythology, as far as German literature, and into a new ideology, as far as the philosophy of the young Hegel was concerned. Relying

on his perfect knowledge of the works of the young Hegel and of the literature about the specific problem of Hellenism, Gray proves that to Hegel Greek man lived in a homogeneous world. He did not need to construct principles of religion, morality, society, state, etc., he found and realized them through his innermost character. Modern man has to refer to historical tradition to achieve what the Hellenic man possessed by nature. Only the teachings of Christianity made modern man superior, and finally able to re-establish on a higher level the inner unity of the ancient man.

To the historian of literature two questions of greater importance are not answered—in fact, not even touched upon. How far was Hegel's Hellenic Ideal his own product, and how much did he owe to his intimate contact with Hölderlin? Secondly, what are the distinct differences between the Hellenism of the young Hegel and that of the young Schelling who during the first decade of the nineteenth century influenced the literary and scientific life in Germany even more than Hegel?

On the whole, however, the work of Gray is a clear, thorough, and well informed study.

GEORGE STEFANSKY

City College, New York

Coleridge Fille, A Biography of Sara Coleridge. By EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 259. \$3.75.

The enduring strength of the ties forged by Coleridge with Southey and Wordsworth in their ardent youth is well illustrated in the life of his only daughter. In her early years her mind was formed by her father's friends more than by her father himself, and towards the end of her life the successive deaths of Dora Wordsworth, her brother Hartley, and finally of Wordsworth, brought her the feeling that the world in which she had grown up was passing away. Learned, charming, sensitive, and with an exceptional understanding of the relationship between literature and life, Sara Coleridge spent the whole of her fifty years in close contact with authors and poets. As a result her biography is inevitably in some measure a study in the transition from the Romantic to the Victorian Age.

None the less the dominating figure in the story of her life is S. T. C. Brought up as Sara was by her mother as a member of the Southey household, one would have thought that some bias against her father was inevitable, but her devotion to both her parents was as genuine as it was remarkable. No one understood better the failure of their marriage; she could even analyse it im-

personally in such a penetrating passage as that quoted on pp. 105-6, which no student of Coleridge can afford to ignore. Yet she gave her mother more sympathy and support than did any other member of the family, and she devoted her best energies to editing her father's works and furthering his reputation.

Professor Griggs has written a pleasant and interesting book, even though his method involves a certain amount of unnecessary repetition, and his style is sometimes unwittingly colored by the sentiment of the period of which he writes. But his enthusiasm for his subject is genuine, and he fully justifies his implied claim that the story of Sara Coleridge's life is worth retelling. If one must cavil at something, I shall merely point out that it is inaccurate to say (pp. 151-2) that "with the text of the *Biographia Literaria* she did no more than correct typographical errors." The text for the 1847 edition of this work was prepared for the press not by Sara but by Henry Nelson Coleridge before his death, and the alterations extended much further than the mere correction of typographical errors.

R. C. BALD

Cornell University

Letters on Poetry from W. B. YEATS to Dorothy Wellesley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 216. \$2.50.

This is a charming book, and one which is invaluable for the study of Yeats. Its value and certainly its charm have been enhanced by the fact that Dorothy Wellesley has not been timid in her editing. She has printed a number of her own letters, has supplied notes (including two long notes on conversations with Yeats), has preserved Yeats' spellings, and, in general, has refused to tidy up the thoroughly personal correspondence. Whether this restraint is the effect of a sophisticated tact unusual to find, or merely the result of a rather callow naiveté is beside the point. We remain in her debt in any case.

Her own poems (which she prints in the volume) are naive and sometimes even childish. If the seriousness with which Yeats took them—he suggests revisions and seems genuinely to admire them—comes as a shock to the reader, this lack of judgment is only one instance of a naiveté on the part of the great poet which is revealed throughout the volume. For example, during the period which the correspondence covers (May 30, 1935–Dec. 1, 1938) Yeats was at work on his *Oxford Book of Modern Verse*. The letters make it perfectly plain why the great poet was able to produce so one-sided and so wrong-headed an anthology. His ignorance of modern American poetry was amazing: he writes in 1935, "Do you know the work of Elinor Wylie? Since I found your work I have had

as sole excitement here 'Eagle and Mole,' a lovely heroic song." His lack of proportionate values is equally startling: he writes of his *Oxford Book*, "here is the present calculation of number of pages. T. S. Eliot 14½ pages, Turner 17 pages, Lady Dorothy 17½ pages, Edith Sitwell 19 pages but nobody will count."

In general, Yeats' blindsides and crochets, his foibles and personal vanities, are revealed by the correspondence quite mercilessly. One feels that, insofar as the editor is concerned, they are revealed unwittingly. At any rate, not in spite of but because of these revelations, Yeats emerges as the really great figure which we have taken him to be. His greatness can survive the exposure—does survive it. It is fortunate that these letters which throw so much light on the later poems and, in general, on his quality of mind have not been needlessly held back but have been allowed to appear in print so soon.

CLEANTH BROOKS

Louisiana State University

El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho de ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ DE TOLEDO. Edited by LESLEY BYRD SIMPSON. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939. Pages xii + 361.

To make a faithful reproduction of the Escorial MS, which the present text purports to do, indicating all deviations, would seem to be preferable to the procedure of Pérez Pastor, who in his edition of 1901 changed arbitrarily anything which seemed to him due to scribal carelessness. A few readings which the 1901 editor transcribed incorrectly or mistook for errors appear to have been restored. There remains, however, the question of mechanical interpretation, and it is doubtful whether a photostatic copy, with which the editor worked, can be deciphered as accurately as the MS itself.

In his *prólogo* the editor states that he has gone so far as to preserve the *desigualdades y arbitrariedades* of the scribe, but, contradictorily, that he has made certain emendations, conforming principally to Pérez Pastor. Indeed, he has preserved some blunders and attempted to correct others. To be consistent he should either have reproduced the MS exactly or endeavored to make the text read satisfactorily throughout. Among his emendations I have noted a few which, in my opinion, vitiate the meaning or are at least unnecessary.

The editor has set out to punctuate the work in the modern manner, and on the whole, where the meaning is apparent, the present edition is easier to follow than that of Pérez Pastor, which is notoriously deficient in punctuation. Departing from Spanish

usage, he has generally placed a comma before *e* and certain other conjunctions used to connect the last member of a parallel series of more than two. He has failed in several instances to set off non-restrictive phrases, and he might well have inserted commas in many places where not required by modern usage as an aid to comprehension, especially since pauses and modifiers in the Arch-priest's language often come unexpectedly. He does not set off the adverb *pero*, and he splits the illative conjunction *tanto que* except in one case. At times he injects exclamation and interrogation in a seemingly impertinent manner.

It would have been well to use *comillas* instead of italics to designate quotations, and the dash instead of quotation marks to show direct discourse. The dash is used only as in English, and parentheses have nowhere been utilized. The editor makes no mention of the cedilla with *c* before *e* and *i*, although Pérez Pastor wrote it with considerable regularity in the combinations *sce* and *sci*, and erratically elsewhere.

A good many passages have been noted wherein the editor seems to have overlooked the most logical and reasonable interpretation, rejecting sometimes punctuations already satisfactory in Pérez Pastor. It is obviously idle to attempt to punctuate the garbled passages which he has preserved.

It hardly seems properly within the scope of the work to indicate its *refranes* and popular sayings, as the editor has undertaken to do by the use of italics. Moreover, there are several allusions to proverbs, and adaptations, which are quite as important as the proverbs themselves, but which go untreated.

Although some of the sayings are, to be sure, difficult to recognize, I have discovered upwards of forty which the editor fails to indicate, but which may be found recorded in closely similar or identical form in the current dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, in one or more of the well-known Spanish *refraneros*, or in both. There are besides these at least seventeen which by their tokens may be regarded as popular sayings beyond any reasonable doubt. It may be said, then, that no less than fifty, and perhaps sixty or seventy in all, have escaped the editor's notice. He has detected those labeled with the word *prouerbio* or *enziemplo*, but has missed others such as: *a buen callar llaman Sancho*; *Fizonos Dios, maravillamonos nos*; *mal de muchos gozo es*; *mas sabe el loco en su casa quel cuerdo en el agena*; and *Ojos ay que de lagaña se agradan*.

Some of the shortcomings of the present edition may be accounted for by the fact that it is a work of collaboration between Mr. Simpson and his students, as he has acknowledged in his preface. He suggests that his text is to serve as a basis for such projects as a glossary, a grammar, and a study of its variants. Rather, these studies should serve as a basis for a definitive text, which deserves a more unified and painstaking treatment. Finally, it is my belief

that a great part of the meaning and spirit of the *Arcipreste de Talavera* has eluded its editor, and that we must still await an acceptable text.

M. IRVING SMITH

The University of Texas

The Art of Courtly Love. By ANDREAS CAPELLANUS with introduction, translation, and notes by JOHN JAY PARRY. *Records of Civilization*, volume XXXIII. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xi + 218.

Professor Parry deserves the deep gratitude of all students and teachers in the mediaeval field. The work of Andreas Capellanus is a unique and indispensable document. While it has been used most extensively by scholars interested in mediaeval literature, it is equally if not more important to the historian of social ideas and practices. No one who studies or teaches mediaeval civilization can afford to neglect it. Now that Mr. Parry has made it available for rapid and easy perusal there is no excuse for neglecting it.

The introduction supplied by Mr. Parry is concise yet highly adequate. In the space of twenty-four pages it furnishes the information required for intelligent reading of the book. Mr. Parry believes that troubador poetry came from Arabic origins and presents an excellent summary of the arguments for this point of view. As I agree with him, his answer to the opposition seems to me sufficient. Others may feel that he has not done justice to their theories. In attempting to place the work of Andreas in its historical background Mr. Parry has accepted the contention of Miss Amy Kelly that it describes conditions at the court of Eleanor of Aquitaine in Poitiers during the years 1170-1173. I am inclined to believe that this conclusion is not in accord with the available evidence, but it is a matter of very slight significance.

Any one who compares my translation of certain passages from *The Art of Courtly Love* with Mr. Parry's will see that it would be pure impertinence for me to review this part of his work. I can only say that it is the type of translation desired by scholars. The stylistic peculiarities of Andreas and his involved, repetitious, and occasionally confused form of expression are preserved with remarkable fidelity. The reader of Mr. Parry's translation is as close to the mind of Andreas as the English language can bring him.

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours. By HILL, R. T. and BERGIN, T. G. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. xv + 363.

The appearance of a Provençal anthology in English is not to be lightly dismissed. It may even herald the day when the graduate student will no longer acquire the habit of referring to a celebrated romance as the "Karrenritter" and cease to regard its author as a redoubtable Panzerkommandant named Kristian von Troyes.

That, in the hundred fifty-four texts, some might have been omitted and others substituted, is true of this collection, as it would be of any. Messrs Hill and Bergin have done well enough on that score. To be commended is the frequent inclusion of *vida* and *razo*, not as "hors d'œuvre" (Appel, Crescini), but integrated, as is proper, with the text. Chabaneau, where more than one editor has gone for a ready-made biography of his troubadour, was often rejected, and rightly, (pp. 54,55), his texts being riddled with errors and lacunae carried over straight from Raynouard. But why Mahn was at times preferred is a puzzle, for he is old, incomplete in manuscripts (many a time *B* alone used), and certainly not devoid of errors. There are the necessary microfilms in this country and reliable diplomatic reprints, the only suspicious one being that of *P*, of which the photostat is in the Library of Congress. Here was an opportunity for some original work that the editors could have used to great advantage. As it is, secondary sources were almost exclusively relied on.

Some of these are unnecessary and dubious. Why take Lommatzsch as the source for the *vida* of the Monk of Montaudon (p. 106) or so second rate a work as Berry's *Florilège* for the texts of 89 and 91? Why not, rather, Bartsch, *Lesebuch*, col. 140, for the latter?

Pedagogically, there is a good deal to be desired. Small pieces like songs are not hard to place in an anthology. Larger items take more circumspection. Unless there are a few words of synopsis, between excerpts, the student's idea of the *Sancta Fides* or the *Boethius* will be vague. Not much help is offered in two pages of notes devoted to two hundred forty pages of text. There are many historical allusions throughout and such a line as *Del menor tertz d'amor son gran poder*, in Guiraut de Calanso's famous poem (p. 159), must remain an enigma, without adequate comment. Often a mere reference will suffice, as in the case of Peire's *Chantarai d'aquestz trobadors* (p. 71); e. g. *MP. xxxi* (1933-4), p. 19 (Pattinson). The reader is not forewarned about the non-Provençal of the *descort* on p. 125 nor the *sirventes* of B. Calvo (p. 200). The vocabulary is not entirely adequate. With the existing aids what could the beginner do with the first strophe on p. 76, for instance? Some idioms are not explained: *ieu l'agra vis* (p. 108). Spelling

variants that must bother one not accustomed to Provençal are not dealt with in the glossary (*giquir*, which seems to occur more often than *gequir* in this book, is absent; *masan* is not there, but *mazan* is, and so forth, because examples are not wanting). *G(u)verdon* is not to be found at all. Some phonological forms could likewise have been explained: *albe* (p. 127).

The Yale Press has done a magnificent job of printing and binding and perhaps some graduate students will not be sorry to abandon the wretched paper and type of certain foreign chrestomathies. However, the book sells for five dollars. Since we have here a collection of texts, without notes, virtually, and with a not too rich vocabulary, derived essentially from secondary sources, one asks what is the *raison d'être* of such an anthology. It is possible to reproduce these texts much more cheaply and, in the present crisis, some among those few that teach Provençal have been doing so.¹

A. H. SCHUTZ

Ohio State University

The Theatre of the Basoche. The Contribution of the Law Societies to French Mediaeval Comedy. By HOWARD GRAHAM HARVEY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 255. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages, XVII.)

When he gave up Law for Romance, Mr. Harvey did not burn his books. He preferred to apply his knowledge of his earlier discipline to an investigation in the field of French drama. He even retained the flavor of his legal studies by arranging his material in the form of a brief: *Presenting the case, The Documentary Evidence, The Summing up*. And though a lawyer's special pleading is usually anathema to a scholar, the results he achieves are interesting and important.

He finds that in the moralities, farces, and *sotties* of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth there is far less satire of the law than has hitherto been supposed, much less than there is in other *genres* of the time. Failure to recognize this fact has led scholars to overlook the large amount of realism in the dramatization of court procedure. The mildness of the satire seems due to the fact that these plays were largely the work of law clerks or of young lawyers who either shared the point of view of their professional superiors, or stood in awe of them, or were directly restrained

¹ For the sake of completeness may we add to the mention of Professor Shepard's edition of Aimeric de Peguilhan, in preparation, those of J. Boutière (A. de Sisteron), completed but apparently unpublished, Mlle Dumitrescu and R. S. Aston (Peirol), R. Lavaud (Peire Cardenal) a work that has been going on for years, E. D. Healy (Lanfanc Cigala), Ph.D. thesis, North Carolina (completed) and the collaborative task of J. Boutière and A. H. Schutz (*vidas* and *razos*), of which one volume is reported printed "mais non broché" (!) by Privat, Toulouse.

by their censorship. When they did satirize legal processes with vigor, the attack was usually made upon ecclesiastical or rural courts, which had lost their standing in the eyes of the more important members of the profession.

Mr. Harvey believes that in *Patelin* the court is an ecclesiastical one, the title-role that of a "self-styled, more or less self-taught practitioner, a would-be advocate" (p. 160). He holds that the satire is directed chiefly against the litigant—the draper,—to a lesser degree against *Patelin*, and that the judge is not satirized at all. As the author's chief purpose was to excite laughter, Mr. Harvey finds that the farce has been taken too seriously as a social document. He mentions in this connection only Renan. If, as seems likely, he also had in mind the late R. C. Holbrook, the latter would certainly have pardoned the thrust in view of the fact that Mr. Harvey accepts Alecis as the author of the play.

I hope that Mr. Harvey will now apply his knowledge of French law and practice—if not his gift at pleading—to later periods of French dramatic history.¹

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois: vol. I (*La Phase bilingue*), vol. II (*La Phase française*). By SÉRAPHIN MARION. *Publications sériees de l'Université d'Ottawa*, nos. V and XII. Hull and Ottawa, 1939-1940. Pp. 185 + 191. \$2.00.

The author of *Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois* has been publishing substantial literary and historical studies for some twenty years. As the work of an established scholar, the present researches into eighteenth-century Canadiana are particularly welcome. M. Marion limits his first two volumes to competent critical surveys of the *Gazette littéraire de Montréal* (1778-1779) and the bilingual *Gazette de Québec* (1764-1806). Despite many and often painful puerilities, both weeklies provide invaluable records of what passed for intellectualism in a colonial society infected, naturally enough, with the dilettantism of the Ancien Régime.

Until about 1790, the *Quebec Gazette*, under English editorship, catered laboriously to the fashion for Voltaire among French subscribers. In 1793 enthusiasm for the Revolution was replaced by violent condemnation, which eventually made way for diatribes against Bonaparte. In the Montreal journal, Voltaire received invective as well as panegyric, although the defenders understood only his stylistic genius, and the critics stressed only his irreligion.

¹ I note only a few slips: pp. 20, 91, 254, read Tallemant; p. 159, for evidence that Jehan de Noyon was a bishop rather than a lawyer cf. U. T. Holmes, *MLN.*, LV (Feb., 1940), 105-8; p. 168, for 18—read 1855-9 (the volume number should be added); pp. 174, 182, for Madame read Made-moiselle.

M. Marion shows effectively how nebulous voltairianism had become after crossing the Atlantic. Boileau and La Fontaine were the only other authors to win much approbation in eighteenth-century Montreal, and even Rousseau figures but three times in the *Gazette littéraire*.

Current French literature, however, formed only part of the stock-in-trade of the two weeklies, which abound in local verse and news oddities. Among frequent polemics are interspersed mildly engaging dissertations on feminism, fashions, free-masonry, literary taste, insect bane, excessive eulogy, the evils of cards, and the "état présent de l'hymen en Angleterre."

Two Frenchmen of questionable probity published the *Gazette littéraire* for an *Académie de Montréal*, the precise character of which still invites investigation. As members, M. Marion has unearthed the two editors, two anonymous Québécois, and some unnamed students in Montreal. While the *Gazette* might not have been above inventing an imaginary society, a forged protest against it would hardly have been attributed in print to the Sulpician Montgolfier. Consequently, the possibility, advanced elsewhere, that the *Académie de Montréal* did not exist must be rejected.

M. Marion has been criticized for "feuding" with Voltaire. Since his manifest objectivity in presenting facts is not affected by this incidental consideration, it should be mentioned merely for readers expecting to find support for the fallacy that French-Canadian literature reflects only prudery and parochialism.¹

Despite minor imperfections, *Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois* does great credit to French scholarship in Canada. The author has accomplished a practical compromise between research and a semi-popular style. Thoroughly aware of their shortcomings, M. Marion is careful to qualify the content of the two Gazettes as "babioles qui éternisent un débat, du signolage autour de gentils riens" (II, 89). The first volume successfully represents the mingled effect of British politics and French interests in Quebec society during the first years of English domination.

The second volume establishes the need for more research on the rôle of the French eighteenth century in Canadian thought. Much has been published concerning the influence of later French poets, but M. Marion's findings involve a socio-literary field which others have left virtually untouched. In the meantime, his extensive explorations will further sympathetic understanding of a period in Canadian history when the future of indigenous French literature was still in grave jeopardy.

EDWARD B. HAM

University of Michigan

¹ Despite obvious aversion, M. Marion is careful to give Voltaire his due (e.g., I, 56; II, 34, 62). Nor has he failed to insist, for instance, that "ceux qui ne reconnaissent pas le droit de peindre le péché demandent, en somme, la suppression d'à peu près toute la littérature" (*Sur les Pas de nos littérateurs*, p. 185).

BRIEF MENTION

Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen, und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnet's "Theory of the Earth." By DR. ELISABETH HALLER. Bern: A. Francke, 1940. Pp. xiv + 179. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 9.) It was the late Professor Fehr of Zurich who suggested to Dr. Haller a study of the three versions of Burnet's *Theory of the Earth* in order to determine whether we are justified in speaking of a baroque style in English prose. The reasons for the choice of this work have been, 1, the existence of Latin, German, and English versions of about the same date, and, 2, the fact that Burnet, not being a *Dichter*, that is, an individual or imaginative writer, better represents the prevailing prose conventions of his time. There is something to be said, however, against both of these reasons. In the first place, the English version of the *Theory* is not a translation of the Latin one, but, as Dr. Haller shows, a very free re-writing of it. Dr. Haller faithfully studies all three versions, but it must be said that a stylistic comparison of them is not fruitful. In the second place, the period of the *Theory*, the last quarter of the 17th century, is not the best time for a study of the baroque, which was at its height in the first and second quarters of the century.

These limitations were inherent in the task that Dr. Haller undertook. Her performance itself is competent and workmanlike. She finds her tests of the baroque style in Wölfflin's famous *Renaissance und Barock*, and in studies by two later scholars of the specific subject of baroque in English literature, and applies these tests in a study of, 1, the vocabulary, 2, the imagery, and, 3, the form of the rhetorical period in Burnet's work. Her conclusions are that we are justified in speaking of a baroque English style, and that the Latin shows least baroque character, the German most of the three.

Wölfflin's remarkable work concerned itself with style in the arts of design alone. To transpose his principles into the terms of literature is far from easy, and the attempt is likely to lead to confusions. But confusion is worse confounded when the common denominator of literature and painting is sought, as it is in fact sought by a number of German students of literary baroque, in certain abstract ideas concerning the nature of the 17th century mind. For example, a scholar quoted by Dr. Haller characterizes the period of baroque as an age of "Expansion—Concentration," "Makrokosmos—Mikrokosmos." Under such a generalization one may show almost anything and include about everything; and it is not surprising that this scholar includes, in fact, things so different as Lyly's *Euphues* and Donne's sermons in the baroque style. Dr. Haller herself does not deal in such philosophic obfuscations, and encourages them only by quotation from others.

MORRIS W. CROLL

Princeton University

The Study of the Nibelungenlied, Being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937. By MARY THORP. (*Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*). Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. vi + 196. \$4.25. This book purports to present "the story of the change of public opinion, of the beginning and ever-increasing growth of the study of the epic and legend" of the NL from 1755 to 1937. The first and most valuable chapter offers the gradual evolution of the theories concerning origin, authorship and home of the NL. Hundreds of well-known authors and critics pass by the reviewing stand to express their viewpoints in thesis and antithesis. Tackled from all possible directions, now with the Rhenish problem, now with the Danubian, Bavarian, Austrian or Hungarian in the foreground, this century-old question, which has revolved chiefly about "Einheitstheorie" or "Liedertheorie" and even stirred the best of scholars to private feuds, culminates in disparate, but suggestive theories, as proffered in this last decade by men like Schroff, Gareis, Schütte and Körner. Of lesser importance is the discussion of the MS-criticism in which the respective merits of the shortest, longest, most elaborate and best text of the MSS is weighed. The last chapter is devoted entirely to a chronologically ordered bibliography of several hundred titles, listing all works on the NL-theories, MHG editions (49), NHG translations (70), translations into English (11), and the numerous adaptations of the NL, from Hans Sachs to Bachmeister. It need hardly be said that this history of the NL-theories and this bibliography, prepared with utmost thoroughness, make this book indispensable for any student of the NL. With a deep sense of pessimism one lays the book aside, to ask: Shall we ever really know? Yet, might not the solution be as simple as the egg of Columbus and, as Schroff would have it, might not Pilgrim have been the compiler after all (Klage: "*Von Pazzowe der bischof Pilgrim . . . hiez er schriben diz maere.*")?

CARL SELMER

*Hunter College of the
City of New York*

The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players. By GERALD EADES BENTLEY. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1941. 2 vols. Pp. xx + 344, viii + pp. 343 [*sic*]-750. \$12.50. Professor Bentley's laudable purpose is "to carry on the admirable survey made by Sir Edmund Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage* from 1616, his terminal date, to the closing of the theatres in 1642." Later volumes will treat the plays, the playwrights, the theaters, and the "conditions of play production." Mr. Bentley first summarizes the histories of the old

companies before 1616 and continues them to 1642. The new companies are then dealt with in the order of first appearance. A special feature of the dictionary of actors is the quotation of "every scrap of biographical evidence (except for the careers of English actors in Germany)," after, that is, 1616.

That these volumes will be warmly welcomed goes without saying. Mr. Bentley is closing the gap between the encyclopedic works of Sir Edmund Chambers on the earlier drama and those of Professor Allardyce Nicoll on the later. He proceeds, it is true, only to 1642; but the remaining years down to 1660, when Mr. Nicoll begins, are already well covered in Dr. Leslie Hotson's *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* is a generous performance: evidence is stated, quotation is full, difficulties are never dodged. A valuable appendix gives, among other things, wills of theatrical interest, evidence for the closing of the theaters because of plague, and the theatrical entries in Sir Humphrey Mildmay's diary and account book (1632-43). In short, Mr. Bentley has provided us with a tool the indispensability of which is self-evident, and students of seventeenth-century drama will gratefully but impatiently await the appearance of his remaining volumes.

H. S.

A Revolution in European Poetry. By EMERY NEFF. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 249. \$3.00. Some provincialism in knowledge and taste is as inevitable as it is in a measure desirable. When there is available in the native tongue a poetry incredibly rich in range and quality, a certain lack of cosmopolitanism is understandable if not altogether pardonable. It may be, as Mr. Neff states, that Americans, having achieved literary independence, although harboring few illusions of literary greatness, are in a favorable position to make and profit from an impartial appraisal of the major poetry of Italy, Germany, and France, as well as that of England. It is perhaps true that the literature of England has tended to dominate too exclusively our attention and our judgment of continental writers.

This book undertakes a peculiarly difficult task—that of tracing in a fairly brief volume the course of poetry in the chief European languages from the late seventeenth to the twentieth century. Foreign language difficulties are met, in so far as is possible, by giving the many and well chosen illustrative selections in both the original and in translation. The English poets are generously represented. To say that the book is written primarily for the intelligent and interested layman is not at all to imply that it is a work of facile condensation and generalization. Mr. Neff has written a skilful, thoughtful, apt, and integrated account of the

major figures, influences, ideas, moods, and forms which make up both the national and international mosaic of eighteenth and nineteenth century European poetry. It is a summation which could be made only by a scholar and a critic sensitive to literary values. Commendable is the writer's avoidance of such omnibus terms as 'neo-classic' and 'romantic,' which more often than not are a hasty device for avoiding responsibility.

"The liberation of lyricism in France [with Rimbaud and Verlaine] completed the cycle of the European revolt against the taste of the era of Louis XIV." Detached objectivity is no doubt an admirable quality; but in the context of the last chapter—despair, ineradicable depravity, brutal realism, esoteric ennui, maladjustment, lost faiths, jaded sophistication, reckless futility—that word "liberation" spells a curious victory.

C. P. LYONS

The University of Florida

Darwinism in the English Novel, 1860-1910. By LEO J. HENKIN. New York: Corporate Press, 1940. Pp. 303. \$3.00. This book makes interesting reading; so much so that this reviewer found it difficult to lay it down before its end. It is a straightforward treatise, the material of which is apparent from the title. Dr. Henkin hews so strictly to the line, in fact, that his structure becomes a little mechanical, and some of the possibilities in his topics remain unrealized. For example, although he mentions Lucretius once or twice, he fails to indicate the wide-spread interest which educated men of the eighteenth century had in the speculations of the great Latin "atheist," and hence neglects background important to an understanding of, say, the animus behind that satiric laughter which was directed against Lord Monboddoo's orang-outangs. He tends also, while over-emphasizing H. G. Wells, to underemphasize Hardy, who was an incomparably greater artist than Wells, but whose relation to evolutionary science is less apparent. To confine discussion of Hardy, as Dr. Henkin does, to a few general comments with brief reference to *Two on a Tower* and *A Pair of Blue Eyes*, omitting consideration of more important works like *The Return of the Native*, *Tess*, and *Jude*, whose whole tragic spirit is dependent upon Hardy's acceptance of evolutionary science, is misleading. Nevertheless these are details, however important; and to dwell too much upon them is unfair to the author. Dr. Henkin's chapters on the history of science itself are admirable—brief, simply worded, clear enough to enlighten a reader unacquainted with the standard histories of evolutionary ideas, and yet original enough to interest one who does have previous knowledge of the subject. His numerous summaries of novels—sum-

maries which are of vital importance to his treatise—are remarkably vivid and compact. Anyone completing the book will emerge with much clearer understanding of one important chapter in the history of English novels, and with the satisfaction of having been interested and amused as well as profitably instructed.

GEORGE R. POTTER

University of California

Maurice Hewlett: Historical Romancer. By ARTHUR BRUCE SUTHERLAND. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1938. (Dissertation.) Pp. x + 199. In this dissertation Dr. Sutherland traces the course of Maurice Hewlett's career as a romancer, giving full critical summaries of his more important books and ending with a biographical chapter where, unfortunately with some effect of repetition, he undertakes to show how the work sprang naturally from the varying circumstances of Hewlett's life. The chief value of the dissertation seems to lie in its establishment of three or four historical points about Hewlett, rather than in any detail of aesthetic criticism. The arc of Hewlett's reputation, shooting up at the turn of the century and then trailing off sadly as he insisted on cultivating the wrong fields, is clearly shown. So too is the painstaking research which underlay the novels, the earlier ones especially—research, by the way, of which Hewlett makes his reader all too well aware. Still another point is the derivative nature of Hewlett's work, a subject of bitter argument between him and the critics, whose view of it was less pleasant than his. (Hewlett declared that he detested Meredith and never read his novels, yet the critics have always found the hand of Meredith heavy upon him.) Again, Dr. Sutherland brings out well Hewlett's strong social preoccupation in his later work, notably his interest in divorce reform and his glorification of the English peasant in *The Song of the Plow*. Of Dr. Sutherland's own style one might say that more pains would have helped it. As for the implication that when the time is no longer out of joint Hewlett will come into his own again, it is, one supposes, to be expected; a pious hope, but here, as in most cases, a pretty forlorn one.

J. T. HILLHOUSE

University of Minnesota

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

MAY, 1942

Number 5

FOOTE AND A FRIEND OF BOSWELL'S:

A NOTE ON *The Nabob*

In writing a note on Foote's *Nabob*, or more specifically on the prototypes of his hero Sir Matthew Mite, one must first lay a ghost. "*The jaghure, and a thousand other circumstances*," wrote a reviewer in the *London Magazine*, "*point out a certain lord*."¹ The certain lord, says Miss Belden in the only modern study of Foote, was "Sir Matthew White."² "Another claimant," echoes the *TLS.*, "is advanced in the person of Sir Matthew White."³ For George Garrick wrote to David from Bath 17 January 1775: "Mr. Foote set off for town yesterday morning, but, what is very extraordinary, is to dine with General Smith (at Sir Matthew White's,) and likewise lie all night in his way there, and thus by strong invitation. Foote is afraid they will put him in the coal-hole."⁴ But there really was no Sir Matthew White. This baronet owes his existence to a mistake by Boaden, the editor of the Garrick correspondence. An examination of the manuscript reveals that George Garrick wrote "(as S^r Mathew Mite)"⁵—a parenthesis which makes excellent sense.

¹ *London Magazine*, xli (July, 1772), 309 n.

² Mary M. Belden, *The Dramatic Works of Samuel Foote* (New Haven, 1929), p. 148.

³ "The English Aristophanes," *TLS.*, May 22, 1930, p. 421.

⁴ *Private Correspondence of David Garrick* (London, 1832), II, 41.

⁵ I am indebted to Mr. William Van Lennep and Mr. Winchester Stone for an examination of the photostat in the Harvard Library and for pointing out evidence that George Garrick was at Bath (e.g., *Posthumous Letters . . . to Francis Colman, and George Colman, the Elder* [London, 1820], pp. 302-4). General Smith was apparently at his estate of Chilton in Berkshire. Cf. *post* note 31.

One of the points which I wish to stress, however, is that there are in Foote's play allusions to more than one nabob. First of course there is General Richard Smith, a soldier of low origin who had catapulted into prominence and command of the Bengal army. His father had perhaps kept a little cheese shop in Jermyn Street, St. James's Market; and as early as 1770, on his return voyage to England, the General showed himself unusually sensitive to remarks about cheese.⁶ The *London Magazine* was quick to point out a reference to the General in the name "Sir Matthew Mite" ("Mite" means "cheesemonger"), and a few years later the *Town and Country Magazine* went into some detail about the cheese shop.⁷ One might easily be tempted to see a good deal more of General Smith in Foote's amateur gambler Sir Matthew. Doubtless the gambling activity of General Smith which Walpole and others describe had begun before the appearance of Foote's play in June 1772. Sir Matthew is instructed in the niceties of gambling by a writer from Almack's.⁸ General Smith was excluded from Almack's, though at what date is not clear, and with some friends built a magnificent club in St. James's Street.⁹ But the General had in 1772 not yet begun his notorious political career, and on the whole he seems to have attracted more attention after Foote's play than before it. The name "Mite" in the play perhaps did something to further his reputation.

Another nabob who must be considered is Mr. Thomas Rumbold. He, like Smith, became much more notorious at a later date, but had already made his bow in the corrupt parliamentary election of 1770 at New Shoreham, Sussex. The constable of the borough declared Rumbold's election illegal and refused to return him. The House of Commons sustained a petition by Rumbold and repri-

⁶ *Memoirs of William Hickey*, I (London, 1913), 234-40. The chief published source for General Smith's Indian career would seem to be a footnote in the Historical Manuscript Commission's *Report on the Palk Manuscripts* (London, 1922), p. 113. For a bibliography on the General see James M. Holzman, *The Nabobs in England* (New York, 1926), pp. 162-3. Holzman is a valuable guide to our whole subject—though often inaccurate.

⁷ *Town and Country Magazine*, VIII (July, 1776), 345.

⁸ *Works of Samuel Foote*, ed. Jon Bee (London, 1830), III, 204-6.

⁹ *The Last Journals of Horace Walpole During the Reign of George III* (London, 1910), I, 545-6, 17 May 1776. Cf. Charles Pigott, *The Jockey Club* (London, 1792), p. 33; Holzman, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

manded the constable, but at the same time they recognized the existence of an organization at New Shoreham which had "profanely assumed the Name of *The Christian Club*," but which was "instituted for the most infamous Purpose, that of selling the Borough to the highest Bidder." And the Commons accordingly acted to incapacitate the members of the Club from voting in future elections.¹⁰ The Christian Club appears in Foote's play as the "Christian Club of the Borough of Bribe-em" and duly offers its representation to Sir Matthew.¹¹

A third nabob—the nabob of all nabobs—is alluded to in the jaghire. The reviewer in the *London Magazine* must have shared a very common conviction when he wrote that the jaghire pointed to "a certain lord." Lord Clive of course. His jaghire was the most sensational of his acquisitions. His India speech in the House of Commons 30 March 1772 contains several references to it;¹² in a public *Letter* to the proprietors of the East India Company in 1764 he had defended the jaghire at length and had presented in an appendix a translation of the perwannah by which the jaghire was granted.¹³ A jaghire was the annual rent for land held under a lease from a nabob or ruler of an Indian province, and Clive's jaghire was for lands in Bengal leased by the India Company, so that he was the landlord of his employers. This munificent gift, amounting to about 30,000 l. a year, had been bestowed on him by his great friend the Nabob Meer Jaffier, whom Clive had elevated after the epochal battle of Plassey in 1757 and had subsequently saved from an invasion by the son of the Mogul.¹⁴

¹⁰ *Journals of the House of Commons*, xxxiii, 14, 38, 39, 58-9, 69-70, 157, 162, 179, 360. See Holzman, *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 96, 159-60. *Town and Country Magazine*, viii (July, 1776), 345, says that General Smith bid for the support of the Christian Club at the same election, but I find no other evidence for this. No doubt it is a conception which derives from the play.

¹¹ *Works*, iii, 215.

¹² *The Parliamentary History of England . . . to the Year 1803*, xvii (London, 1813), 349. "The speeches of Lord Clive and . . . are here printed from their own corrected copies" (p. 328).

¹³ *A Letter to the Proprietors of the East India Stock, from Lord Clive* (London, 1764), pp. 29-36, 72-5. He was answered by *A Letter to the Proprietors of East-India Stock, on the Subject of Lord Clive's Jaghire*, London, 1764.

¹⁴ Clive's *Letter to the Proprietors*, pp. 29-36. Cf. Sir George Forrest,

In 1764 the India directors had resolved to take Clive's jaghire from him, but he had been in a position to persuade them to an extension for ten years and then for ten years more.¹⁵ The only other Anglo-Indian to be offered a jaghire, so far as I have found in my reading of Indian affairs, was Colonel Hector Munro; and he, conscious of its potentialities for trouble, at once returned it.¹⁶ This background must be realized in order to appreciate the humour of the proposal in Sir Matthew's "treaty" for a bride: "Should it be more agreeable to the parties, Sir Matthew will settle upon Sir John and his Lady, for their joint lives, a jagghire."¹⁷ In another scene one of the characters speaks of the "splendid titles" granted to Sir Matthew by a "tribe" in India.¹⁸ This is most likely a reference to Clive. In the appendix to his *Letter* of 1764 Clive had published a translation of the sunnod which Meer Jaffier had obtained from the Emperor of Delhi, by which Clive was made an Omrah or Lord of the Empire, of the command of 5,000 foot and the rank of 6,000 horse, with the titles "Flower of the Empire, Defender of the Country, the Bravo firm in War." It was by his rank as Omrah that Clive was entitled to a jaghire.¹⁹

The *London Magazine* says a "thousand other circumstances" point to Lord Clive. But this need be taken as no more than hyperbole. Sir Matthew sends "some rough diamonds to be polished in Holland."²⁰ Lord Clive had sent his Indian wealth home

The Life of Lord Clive (London, 1918), II, 138-45. Biographers of Clive, from Sir John Malcolm, 1836, to A. Mervyn Davies, 1939, have culled interestingly from the several source collections in print and in manuscript but have not been meticulous about reference. Neither have they been much concerned with details of Clive's reputation during his career. I use the life by Forrest because it is the most specifically documented. I have adopted his spelling of Indian words.

¹⁵ Forrest, *op. cit.*, II, 197-204, 351-8.

¹⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXXIII, 825, *Reports from Committees of the House of Commons*, III (1803), 312, "Thrd Report from the Committee Appointed to Enquire into the . . . East India Company," 8 April 1773.

¹⁷ *Works*, III, 191.

¹⁸ *Works*, III, 219.

¹⁹ Clive's *Letter to the Proprietors*, pp. 29-30, 70. Cf. Forrest, *op. cit.*, II, 138-45.

²⁰ *Works*, III, 209.

in the form of diamonds and gave his reasons in the speech of 30 March 1772,²¹ but the importation of diamonds by nabobs was becoming common.²² Other details of the play—such as the splitting of stock to increase votes,²³ the contemptuous reference to “one of our people from Leadenhall Street; perhaps a director”²⁴—could be connected with Clive but need not be.

The same may be said for a very important example, the “treaty” which Sir Matthew proposes to Sir John Oldham. “A very monarchical address,” Lady Oldham calls it. “Upon a matrimonial union between the young lady and him, all hostilities and contention shall cease, and Sir John be suffered to take his seat in security.”²⁵ The reference is to a Parliamentary seat, but with “hostilities” it suggests the seats which several Indian nabobs had been enabled to assume only through the military effort of the East India Company. In the same scene we hear of “territorial acquisition,” of “lacks of roupees,” of the jaghire, of Meer Jaffier, and of his successor Meer Cossim. All these were certainly calculated to suggest the series of transactions carried out during the past twenty years, by which the English had risen to power in India, and in which Clive had played the leading role military and civil. But in the same transactions many other English nabobs had been involved—General Smith, for example, as commander of the Bengal

²¹ *The Parliamentary History of England*, xvii, 333.

²² Holzman, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.

²³ *Works*, iii, 199. Cf. Forrest, *op. cit.*, ii, 195-6. For an account of East-India shareholding and voting in the General Court of Proprietors see C. H. Philips, *The East India Company 1784-1834* (Manchester, 1940), p. 2 and n. 3; Holzman, *op. cit.*, p. 82 n.

²⁴ *Works*, iii, 199. The whole scene with Mrs. Match'em (*Works*, iii, 208-12) might reflect a part of Clive's reputation which does not find its way into biography. Cf. Forrest, *op. cit.*, ii, 383; A. Mervyn Davies, *Clive of Plassey* (London, 1939), p. 503, Appendix C, “*The Life of Robert, Lord Clive*, by Charles Caraccioli.”

²⁵ *Works*, iii, 190. Clive's red treaty and white treaty with Meer Jaffier by which the intermediary Omichund was cheated of a share in spoils had been brought to light by the Commons Committee in May 1772 (*Journals of the House of Commons*, xxxiii, 806), but the topic may not yet have been widely discussed (cf. Holzman, *op. cit.*, p. 57). In the appendix to his *Letter to the Proprietors*, 1764, Clive had published the text of his treaty with Meer Jaffier (pp. 65-7) and of the later treaty between the Company and Meer Cossim (pp. 88-91).

army. Either Clive or General Smith might be the model when in another scene Sir Matthew says, "I am a military man, and quite a stranger to your legal manoeuvres."²⁶

Other details of the play are even more clearly generic. Sir Matthew will send the Oldham boys to India as "cadets and writers in the Company's service";²⁷ he will "transport" the girls "to Madras or Calcutta, and there procure them suitable husbands."²⁸ He says to one of his agents, "Did you tell that man in Berkshire I would buy his estate?"²⁹ General Smith himself already had Chilton or Chiltern Lodge, near Hungerford, in Berkshire,³⁰ but by 1772 four other Anglo-Indians had estates in the same county. One of these was Sir Francis Sykes and another was Henry Vansittart, both of whom had been high in the Bengal government. Sykes was one of the nabobs who suffered most from unpleasant publicity.³¹

Foote's Sir Matthew is a portrait neither of General Smith nor of Clive nor of any other nabob. It is not a portrait at all; it is not even a caricature, but rather a figure to which are given a name appropriate to one nabob and habits associated with many others, and around which, as it stands inanimate amid certain typical scenes, is thrown a loose supporting pile of East Indian allusions. After the play had appeared, Foote convinced some irate visitors "that he had no particular person in view as the hero of his comedy," that "it was only a *general satire*."³² Foote had learned a certain nomenclature, or jargon; he was familiar enough with

²⁶ *Works*, III, 234. Clive said in the House of Commons: "Trade was not my profession. My line has been military and political" (*The Parliamentary History of England*, XVII, 332).

²⁷ *Works*, III, 191. Cf. Holzman, *op. cit.*, pp. 9, 22 and n.

²⁸ *Works*, III, 191. On the question whether this custom actually obtained, see *Bengal: Past and Present*, VI (July-Dec. 1910), 394-8.

²⁹ *Works*, III, 215.

³⁰ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Palk Manuscripts* (London, 1922), p. 168, letter dated 2 Dec. 1771, "Chilton Lodge, near Hungerford, Berks." "I am now staying with General and Mrs. Smith"

³¹ Holzman, *op. cit.*, pp. 97, 123-4, on Berkshire (it was later to be referred to as "the English Hindostan"); pp. 44, 59, 72, 92, 164, 165-6, on Sykes and Vansittart. *TLS.*, May 22, 1930, p. 421, suggests Sykes as one of Foote's models, but I find nothing that seems especially related to Sykes.

³² William Cooke, *Memoirs of Samuel Foote* (London, 1805), I, 180.

the phenomenon of nabobery to give his play a kind of journalistic verisimilitude.

It is not evident from the play that Foote was personally acquainted with any nabob at the time he wrote, but it is amusing to discover that he probably was. The recently published journals of James Boswell provide the clue and at the same time show us the dramatist and the biographer together in a convivial scene.

When Boswell came down to London in March 1772, he had at least one person of East Indian connections on his calling list. That was his Scotch friend George Dempster, M. P., an India Director in 1769-70 and soon to be elected again.³³ Boswell called one day at Dempster's with a Colonel Donald Campbell, who had been "twenty years" in India and had "received twenty wounds."³⁴ In 1773 Boswell was to find Dempster having breakfast with a "Mr. Gray," and this was most likely the same Gray with whom Boswell and other Scotchmen dined at Samuel Foote's one night during the 1772 visit, and whom Boswell describes in his *Journal* as "Nabob Gray, who had been my schoolfellow at Mr. James Mundell's."³⁵

Boswell nowhere identifies his friend any further, but the first name—George—is preserved for us in a list of Mundell's scholars printed in 1789.³⁶ George Gray entered Mr. Mundell's school in Edinburgh in 1744. Boswell entered in 1746, at the age of six.

³³ *The Private Papers of James Boswell* (Mount Vernon, 1928-1934), ix, 23, 26, 68; *The Royal Kalendar or . . . Annual Register* (London), 1770, p. 213; 1771, p. 213, *London Magazine*, xl (April, 1771), 231; xli (April, 1772), 195; *DNB*.

³⁴ *The Private Papers of James Boswell*, ix, 42, 28 March 1772; Sir Duncan Campbell, *Records of the Clan Campbell in the Military Service of the Honourable East India Company 1600-1858* (New York, 1925), pp. 88-92. Colonel Donald Campbell had been in the Madras army. 20 Feb. 1772 he had requested permission to take a reward from the Nabob of Arcot.

³⁵ *The Private Papers of James Boswell*, vi, 132, 6 May 1773; ix, 54-5, 2 April 1772.

³⁶ A single copy survives, in the possession of Mr. A. Cameron Smith, of Annan, Dumfriesshire. The list, apparently for the use of the scholars at their reunions, was printed by Mundell's daughter-in-law. For this information I am indebted to Mr. John Murray, of Annan. (Cf. John Murray, *James Boswell in Edinburgh*, Yale University doctoral dissertation, 1939, i, 221-27.) Boswell often mentions the reunions of Mundell's

Boswell's old schoolfellow "Nabob" George Gray is almost beyond doubt one George Gray, Jr., a minor nabob whose career can be traced in some detail through various India documents. He was born in Bengal in 1737, but his Writer's Petition preserved at the India Office tells us that he was sent back to be educated at the University of Edinburgh.³⁷ He would have been about the right age to begin preparatory schooling with Mundell in 1744. The family was perhaps Scotch. The father, George, Sr., who had been a Company surgeon in Madras and Bengal, had by 1775 retired to the house and estate of Haddington about fifteen miles from Edinburgh.^{37a}

George, Jr. became a Writer in 1755 and returned to Bengal, where in 1756 he was one of those who escaped from Calcutta just before its capture by the Nabob Surajah Dowla and the ensuing atrocity of the Black Hole. George, Jr. in fact wrote an original account of the loss of Calcutta which survives in the historian Orme's collection of sources at the India Office and is among the documents printed in S. C. Hill's *Bengal*.³⁸ It will be remembered that Clive soon made his second appearance in India, defeated Surajah Dowla at Plassey, created Meer Jaffier Nabob of Bengal, and received the jaghire.

A period of comparative obscurity ensues for Gray, Jr., who is employed as agent at the coastal stations of Balasore and Cuttack.³⁹ Clive returns to England. Meer Jaffier is deposed in favor of Meer Cossim; Meer Jaffier is restored.

scholars (F. A. Pottle, *Index to the Private Papers of James Boswell*, London, 1937, s. v. James Mundell).

³⁷ Holzman, *op. cit.*, p. 144, cites the *Writers' Petitions. Bengal: Past and Present*, v (Jan.-June, 1910), 150, contains a note on Gray, Jr. and his father, drawn from various manuscript records.

^{37a} Obituary, *Scots Magazine*, XLIII (March, 1781), 167; George Taylor and Andrew Skinner, *Survey and Maps of the Roads of North Britain, or Scotland* (London, 1776), Plate 1 (published 6 June 1775). Cf. George Barclay, "Account of the Parish of Haddington," *Archaeologia Scotica*, I (Edinburgh, 1792), 43, 87. For help in tracing Gray, Jr. I am indebted to Mr. Charles Bennett, Mr. Philip Daghlion, and Mr. Samuel Thorne, Jr.

³⁸ *Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages Belonging to the . . . India Office*, vol. II, Part I, *The Orme Collection* (1916), pp. 32, 290; Samuel C. Hill, *Bengal in 1756-1757* (London, 1905), I, 106-9.

³⁹ *Catalogue of Manuscripts . . . Belonging to the . . . India Office*, vol. II, Part I, p. 342; *Bengal: Past and Present*, IV (July-Dec., 1909), 634.

But then Meer Jaffier dies, and his son Najim-ud-Dowlah succeeds him with the approval of the Company's servants. It is a very corrupt occasion, as the reports of the Parliamentary Committee in 1773 will reveal. We have it in the very words of Mohammed Reza Kahn, Naib or deputy to Najim-ud-Dowlah.

After his Excellency had been seated on the Musnud, the General of Council first of all sent a message by *Mootyram*, and afterwards themselves said to me, The Gentlemen who have assisted former Nazims have obtained Presents; now that we have seated his Excellency on the Musnud, and rendered him Service, we hope that he will make Presents to us also: Do you represent this to his Excellency. . . 875,000 Rupees were given to Nine Gentlemen.⁴⁰

The reader may have anticipated that one of these gentlemen was Gray, Jr. He received by a bill on the banking house of Jagat Seth (Merchant of the World) 50,000 rupees (about 11,666 l.) and was promised 50,000 more. It is probable that he had been deriving advantage from another source—one common to the Company's servants—the inland trade in salt, betel nut, and tobacco, a duty-free monopoly, carried on to the ruin of the black merchants and the depletion of the Nabob's revenue.⁴¹

Behold Gray, Jr., then, a member of the Bengal Council, modestly enriched, a king-maker. Behold too his downfall in the person of Clive, who was already on his way back to Bengal, armed with the power for a sweeping reform. Clive's program was received sullenly by the younger servants, and Gray, Jr. was a leader of opposition, despite the fact that he was appointed to a committee to manage a new system of inland trade—or perhaps because he was specially cramped by this. The result is best realized in a message from Clive's Select Committee to the Directors in London.

You will observe from the Consultations, That Mr. *Leycester* stands suspended, and that Mr. *Gray* resigned the Service, while his Conduct, during

⁴⁰ *Reports from Committees of the House of Commons*, III (1803), 410-13, "Third Report from the Committee Appointed to Enquire into the . . . East India Company," App. 84; and see pp. 311-12, text of the Report; p. 386, App. 72; p. 432, App. 85, Mr. Gray's solemn declaration "that no Request or Solicitation was made on his Part to obtain any Present or Gratification whatever."

⁴¹ See Clive's account in *The Parliamentary History of England*, XVII, 334 ff.; and Forrest, *op. cit.*, II, 225-7.

his Residence at *Maulda*, was under Consideration of the Board; you will also perceive the Obstruction given to all public Business, by Cavilling, Debate, and unseasonable Minutes, while these Two Gentlemen remained at the Board Those Minutes are of themselves sufficient Testimony of the Spirit which actuated so extraordinary a Behaviour, they are indecent, violent, and factious, beyond any Thing ever before tolerated in this Government, in the most licentious Times.⁴²

Poor Gray, Jr. had bucked the wrong nabob. He left Calcutta for home 6 February 1766, and on the day before had been compelled to pay 10,000 [rupees?] bail for his banyan or native agent ⁴³—under whose name presumably he had conducted his inland trade.

Clive too came home. Both reformer and reformed were the object of increasing attacks. On 30 March 1772 in the House of Commons, at the start of the debate and inquiry which lasted until next spring, Clive delivered the address to which we have referred; he said of the nabobs, "there has not yet been one character found amongst them sufficiently flagitious for Mr. Foote to exhibit on the theatre in the Haymarket."⁴⁴

It was only three nights later, Thursday, April 2, that in his villa at North End Foote entertained Boswell and his friend "Nabob Gray"—a nabob who must have been stuffed with grievance and gossip about Clive and the whole Indian history. And here we ought to remember Foote's known propensity for studying a guest. Boswell had once "found fault with Foote for indulging his talent for ridicule at the expence of his visitors." And Johnson had replied: "Why, Sir, when you go to see Foote, you do not go to see a saint: you go to see a man who will be entertained at your house, and then bring you on the public stage; who will entertain you at his house, for the very purpose of bringing you on a public stage."⁴⁵ On another occasion, at Foote's house, Boswell was to present his friend Sir Alexander McDonald and add,

⁴² *Reports from Committees of the House of Commons*, III, 518, "Fourth Report," App. 46; and see p. 510, App. 34; pp. 532-4, App. 63; p. 454, "Third Report," App. 100; Forrest, *op. cit.*, II, 263-7, 280-1, 309.

⁴³ *Bengal: Past and Present*, VIII (Jan.-March, 1914), 121, extract from Private Diary of Colonel A. Champion, India Office, Home Miscellany, No. 198.

⁴⁴ *The Parliamentary History of England*, XVII, 357.

⁴⁵ *Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, II, 98, October 1769.

"This is a new *PIECE for your consideration.*"⁴⁶ Foote had already made at least one clear betrayal of his method: in *The Author*, 1757, Cadwallader was modeled on the wealthy and pedigreed Welsh gentleman Apreece, who it would seem consciously coöperated with Foote, even to the extent of lending a suit of his clothes.⁴⁷

On this night at North End the party was exclusive. Boswell came with two fellow Scotch advocates, Andrew Crosbie and Alexander Wight, and a Jermyn-Street banker, Mr. Mayne.⁴⁸

"There was nobody else" there "but Nabob Gray." Foote regaled them with "an elegant dinner, all served upon plate; and he did not say, 'Gentlemen, there's Madeira and Port and Claret.' But, Gentlemen, there's *all* sorts of wine. You'll call for what you chuse." He gave them "noble old hock," of which he had purchased ninety dozen from an ambassador; he gave them "sparkling Champagne, Constantia and Tokay." He took off Faulkner the Dublin printer, told them a story of Johnson and the Methodists, produced his own pedigree. Such was his hospitality that evening.

Sir Matthew Mite in the play does not "recollect" that he "ever had the honour to know" his old schoolfellow Phil Putty.⁴⁹ But Boswell rode home in Nabob Gray's chaise. Foote perhaps went to bed to ruminate *The Nabob, a Comedy, in Three Acts*, which would appear at the Haymarket Theater on June 29. And perhaps Nabob Gray was one of the two who after the appearance of the play called on Foote with cudgels but were so mollified by his urbane reception that they stayed for coffee and then for dinner.⁵⁰

W. K. WIMSATT, JR.

Yale University

⁴⁶ *The Private Papers of James Boswell*, XI, 288, 16 May 1776. The italicized words are an editorial expansion.

⁴⁷ Belden, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-4.

⁴⁸ See DNB., "Andrew Crosbie"; *Oliver and Boyd's Edinburgh Almanack*, 1776, p. 131; F. G. Hilton Price, *A Handbook of London Bankers* (London, 1876), pp. 164-73.

⁴⁹ *Works*, III, 228.

⁵⁰ Cooke, *op. cit.*, I, 177-82.

PAEONIC MEASURES IN ENGLISH VERSE

Sequences of three unaccented syllables are not uncommon in modern English verse. In falling or rising measures, except where a foot is inverted, these sequences form feet of four syllables, the first paeon or the fourth paeon according as the accent comes first or last in the group. But most prosodists regard such feet as irregular, or explain them away on the ground that "contraction" reduces the number of syllables to the normal count. Of those few who admit the existence of "paeons" nearly all apply the name paeon to the dipodic foot in its unshortened form, which is like the first paeon in being stressed on the first of its four syllables, but which carries also a secondary stress on its third. The status of the paeon in English prosody could hardly be more dubious.

A typical treatment of the paeon appears in *The Principles of English Versification*, by Paul Franklin Baum. Answering the question "whether English verse admits of a foot resembling the Greek paeon, - ~ ~ ~," he says that "theoretically it does not, but practically it does. It would, doubtless, be more accurate to describe the foot as ~ ~ ~ ~, for some stress, however slight, is regularly felt on the third syllable." He goes on to analyze examples of verse composed of such feet—all dipodic. In a footnote he dismisses as only "apparent paeons," which "the usual contraction would reduce . . . to triple time," the paeons in the following lines of Poe's "Ulalume":

The leaves they were withering and sere.
Our memories were treacherous and sere.

Here it cannot be intended that we pronounce "with'ring" and "mem'ries" and "treach'rous." Such pronunciation would be scarcely less absurd than a similar pronunciation of "empt'ing" in Swinburne's line:

Come with bows bent and emptying of quivers.

Clearly these "apparent paeons" have this much reality, that all of their four syllables must be pronounced. These feet have at least the *form* of paeons.

It does not seem possible to deny them the name "paeon." For these actually quadrisyllabic feet could be regarded as irregular,

and therefore reducible to nominally trisyllabic feet, only if they appeared in verse of a strict syllabic structure. The verse quoted and in question is not such a structure. A certain amount of syllabic freedom is allowed it in theory as belonging to it by nature—a foot may have either two or three syllables. Nothing in the verse itself suggests that the freedom ends there. Only our theory has assumed that it does and implied that it must. To justify the assumption, “the usual contraction” of quadrisyllabic feet in mixed measures has been invoked. But since such “contraction” expresses nothing of the nature of the thing it purports to explain, it must be meaningless, a useless complication of scholarship.

We may conclude that such paeons as those quoted above are as real as anapests. Paeons in mixed measures of rising or falling verse are syllabically longer feet occurring with shorter ones of similar structure. They are thus in exactly the same condition with respect to the shorter feet among which they occur as are anapests among iambs, and dactyls among trochees. Until such paeons are given their true status in our theory we may expect to find them used mostly as somewhat rare variations among disyllabic and trisyllabic feet. But there are even now a few poems in English which contain a fairly large proportion of such paeons.

The earliest I know of is Shelley’s “A Vision of the Sea.” At the most liberal estimate, the poem contains twenty-eight paeons, or one in every twenty-four feet. Actual elision may reduce the count, however, perhaps to one in twenty-seven feet. If the word “seventh,” for example, is to be pronounced as a monosyllable there is one paeon rather than two in the following tetrameter lines:

And they lie black as mummies on which Time has written
His scorn of the embalmer; the seventh, from the deck.

Poe’s “Ulalume” contains a still larger proportion of paeons: one in every eighteen or nineteen feet. Just seventeen paeons appear in the whole poem of one hundred and four lines. But there are five in the ten lines of the third stanza: that is, in this short passage one foot in every six is a paeon. D. H. Lawrence’s “Piano” contains about the same proportion of paeons as “Ulalume.” Two of them occur together:

A child sitting un/der the pian/o, in the boom/ of the tingling strings.

In Robinson Jeffers' "The Songs of the Dead Men to the Three Dancers" about every ninth foot is a paeon. The first of the three parts of this poem is mainly anapestic. Its movement is varied with a few dissyllabic feet, numerous paeons, and at least one sequence of four unaccented syllables—a natural and not unique development, with obvious implications. The proportion of paeons is even higher than in the third stanza of "Ulalume." The following lines are typical:

Young *ser/pent* in the *veins/* of the *rock,*
In the *mountain* of *jew/els* a young *ser/pent,* in the *veins/* of a *man* a
sweet *viper* all *em/erald* ah *God/dess*

The second part, likewise largely anapestic, contains a very few iambs. About every tenth foot is a paeon. The third part is probably a freely varied mixture of falling and rising feet, perhaps with certain of the feet in the longer lines lacking their light syllables, within the line exactly as at the end. But however it is scanned, the proportion of paeons will be small: anything from one in about sixteen feet to one in twenty-four.

There are passages in Jeffers twice as rich in paeons as the richest so far considered. In the second and third choruses of "The Coast Range Christ" one third of the feet are paeons. And there are groups of three and four lines in these choruses and the first "antichoros," in which half of the feet are paeons. As the shorter feet are not all of one kind, there are more paeons in these brief passages than any other sort of foot. Here, then, we may examine the qualities of a verse that is characteristically paeonic. Such is half the verse (lines 2-5) of the second "choros":

Little *clogs/* on great *glo/ry,* and *sud/denly* he *soared/*
Wide of/ the *Syr/ians* and the *Ro/mans,* and the *world/* that they *rav/aged*
was an *a/tom* in a *mul/titude,* *surround/ed*
By the *splen/dor* of the *dawn's/* lamps *danc/ing* to their *Lord./*
By the *splen/dor,* by the *blaz/ing,* by the *glad/ness,* the brave *choir/* of the
gods/ of the *morn/ing* and the *lords/* of the *nigh/.*

In the examples of verse we have so far examined, only two of the four sorts of paeon have occurred: the first and the fourth. And in the falling or rising measures in which most English verse is written, only these two are possible. But there is a considerable body of verse, most of it fairly recent, in which the two other paeons, the second (˘'˘˘) and the third (˘˘'˘), are common.

This is accentual verse—not in its ancient forms, but as it has been written during the past fifty or seventy-five years.

The nature of this accentual verse has been pretty fully expounded, most notably by Gerard Manley Hopkins in explanation of his system of accentual scansion ("sprung rhythm") and by Robert Bridges in his discussions of "the new prosody," which he derived from Hopkins. These authorities agree at least as to the fundamentals of modern accentual verse: each foot contains a single accented syllable, commonly bearing a natural speech stress, and this syllable may either stand alone and constitute the complete foot, or it may be accompanied by unaccented syllables, in any number and in any position about the stress, before or after it or in both places, except that the stress must not carry on either side of it so many or so heavy syllables that it will be overburdened. As the structure of the feet is determined by no arbitrary principle, but solely by the tendency of the unaccented syllables to group themselves with one or another of the stressed syllables when the verse is read naturally, any sort of foot may follow any other with perfect freedom and with no danger of misreading.

As one might expect, all of the four paeons occur in modern accentual verse. The first and fourth, however, are very rare. Both of these paeons occur in the last stanza, the thirty-fifth, of Hopkins' "Wreck of the Deutschland": "of the Reward," "hero of us." But there is only one other in the whole poem, a first paeon in stanza 31. A very few other such paeons may be found in Hopkins and elsewhere. The second and especially the third paeons are common, and some brief passages contain a high proportion of them:

The appealing/ of the *Passion*/ is tenderer/ in *prayer* apart;
Hopkins, "The Wreck of the Deutschland"
Of the *winter*/ *dawning*, the *strange*/ *unheavenly*/ *glare*.
The *eye* *marveled*—*marveled*/ at the *dazzling*/ *whiteness*;
The *ear* *hearkened*/ to the *stillness*/ of the *solemn*/ *air*;
Bridges, "London Snow"
Stood *listening*/ in the *quiet*/ of the *moonlight*/;
Walter De La Mare, "The Listeners"
We were *born*/ to another/ *look* of the *sky*, certainly:
Now we *lie here*/ by the *river*/ *pastures*:
We *lie*/ in the *mowings*/ under the *thick turf*;
Archibald MacLeish, "Frescoes for Mr. Rockefeller's City"
The *curs* of the *day* *come*/ and *torment him*/

At *distance*, no one but *death*/ the *redeemer*/ will *humble* that *head*,
 The *intrepid*/ *readiness*,/ the *terrible*/ *eyes*.

Robinson Jeffers, "Hurt Hawks"

My scansion of this excerpt from "Hurt Hawks" may need defense, for this poem and others of Jeffers' poems in a similar measure, such as "Gale in April," "Post Mortem," and "The Broken Balance," are among those commonly—almost universally—believed to be in free verse. But Jeffers himself has declared, "My feeling is for the number of beats to the line"—that is, not for the cadence of the line as in free verse. Jeffers, then, did not intend to write free verse. And as the four poems named above, and many others, are exactly patterned in lines of a given number of pulses, it is obvious that Jeffers wrote what he intended, a verse marked by the recurrence of stresses.

It is true that the poems in question may be scanned for the eye as if they were written in a rising meter somewhat interrupted by inversions. For Jeffers constructs his verse in such a way that—with a few doubtful exceptions—every metrically stressed syllable within the line is either preceded or followed by some unstressed syllable with which it may be supposed to form a foot. In consequence, every monosyllabic foot, which would ordinarily declare the accentual nature of the verse it appeared in, may be explained away by linking to its single syllable, however arbitrarily, some adjacent unaccented syllable. It may even be that Jeffers scans his verse in this way, as Bridges believed Milton scanned his irregular rhythms, "by means of fictions."

But such scansions of Jeffers' poetry will not always satisfy the ear. For the feet thus defined are sometimes false in their quantity, too long or too short, so that the verse seems straining to preserve its pace, either skipping ahead with uneasy alacrity or dragging through its motions like a paralytic. This defect may be seen in the lines of "Hurt Hawks" quoted above when they are scanned as if the poem were in rising meter:

The *ours*/ of the *day*/ come and/ torment/ him
 At *dis*/tance, no/ one but *death*/ the *redeem*/er will *hum*/ble that *head*,/
 The *intrep*/id *read*/iness, the *ter*/rible *eyes*./

Some of the feet are just the right length; others almost right may be quickened or slowed enough to fill the required interval of time. But a few will not fit the intervals without strain. In the second

line misscanned, the first foot is too short and the third perhaps too long. In the third line the second foot is too short, the third too long. To correct these false quantities and make the verse readable it is only necessary to restore the accentual scansion. All the evidence indicates that it is the right one. This test of quantity applied to Jeffers' verse published since 1924 indicates that nearly all of it is written in an accentual measure. Most of it is rich in paeons.

A purely paeonic verse has never been written in English, and probably we should find such a verse monotonous. But all of the four sorts of paeon have been widely used in English with other kinds of feet to give variety and flexibility to the verse in which they occur. The authority and success with which they have been used leaves no reasonable doubt of their value. We may blame an inadequate theory for the fact that they have not been used more commonly.

BREWSTER GHISELIN

University of Utah

MATTHEW PRIOR'S FUNERAL

Published information concerning Matthew Prior's funeral has heretofore been limited to the statement in the London journals that Prior's corpse was "splendidly interred."¹ A detailed description of the obsequies may, however, be constructed from the varied data preserved in the manuscript records of Prior's executors, Edward Lord Harley and Adrian Drift.²

On September 21, 1721, three days after Prior's death at Wim-pole, Lord Harley's seat in Cambridgeshire, the funeral cortege left for Westminster.³ There were a hearse and a mourning coach,

¹ *The Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, The Weekly Journal or Saturday's-Post, Applebee's Original Weekly Journal*, issues for September 30, 1721.

² This volume, herein referred to as the Welbeck MS., is now at Welbeck Abbey in the library of the Duke of Portland, who has very kindly given permission for my use of it in this study. It was formerly No. 10860 in the collection of Sir Thomas Phillipps.

³ Welbeck MS., f. 9v.

each drawn by six horses and accompanied by an outrider. The hearse and the horses were covered with plumes and velvet; and coachmen, horsemen, and undertakers all wore mourning, as did the lone passenger in the coach, Dr. William Edmondson, a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Prior's sponsor there.⁴ For the sake of safety and dignity, the cortege traveled slowly, stopping overnight at Ware and arriving at Westminster Abbey at about eight o'clock the following evening. Ten bearers in mourning then carried the body into the historic Jerusalem Chamber, where it lay for the next three days, constantly attended by two watchers.⁵

The funeral occurred on Monday, September 25, between nine and ten o'clock in the evening.⁶ The mourners were met at the gates by four porters in scarves and gowns, each holding a staff topped with black and white plumes. There were twelve more men in mourning holding flambeaux to light the way through the ante-chambers, which were hung in black and decorated with a border of bay, to the Jerusalem Chamber. There, the "pomp of woe" was most evident. The whole room was hung deep in mourning; dozens of wax tapers burned in plate sconces on the wall, and everywhere were buckram escutcheons edged in black. Within a covered railing, and lighted by six large candles in silver holders, stood the bier, draped with a velvet pall bearing silk escutcheons and spread with many white plumes. The coffin itself was covered with fine Genoa velvet. The sides were fitted with eight handles and, richly set off with silvered nails, a large square plate on which were engraved an inscription and a coat of arms.⁷

Since admittance to the Jerusalem Chamber was by invitation only and many of those who were invited were out of town or were ill, the company was not large.⁸ The list of those who did attend is nevertheless interesting as giving some indication of Prior's friendships at the close of his life.⁹ There were five clergymen in addition to the Sub-Dean of Westminster, who officiated in the

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 11, 93, 144.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 9v.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 9v, 11, 143v.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 93v, 95v, 143v-44. We do not have a complete list of those who were invited but did not come. We know, however, that among them were John Gay, Thomas Southerne, Charles Bridgman, and Sir James Thornhill.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 11v. Although in most cases the MS. lists only the surnames, identification is usually made certain by references elsewhere in the volume or in Prior's correspondence.

place of Dr. Atterbury, who was not well: Dr. Robert Friend, Master of Westminster School; John Nicoll, Second Master; Dr. George Harbin, author of *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted*; Dr. William Edmondson, who had come to town in the mourning coach; and Dr. Hilknah Bedford, also a fellow at St. John's and a neighbor of Prior's in Westminster.¹⁰ The pallbearers were Sir James Montagu, Baron of the Exchequer; Mr. Williamson, who had served with Prior as a commissioner of customs;¹¹ Dr. John Freind, the prominent physician and Tory; Dr. John Inglis, physician to William II and Queen Anne; Dr. Alexander Inglis, who had attended Prior during his last illness; and Richard Shelton, Prior's closest friend.

Of the others present, the most prominent were: those two friends of the literary great, Dr. John Arbuthnot and Erasmus Lewis; the portraitists, Michael Dahl, Hugh Howard, and Jonathan Richardson; the painter of landscapes and animals, John Wootton; and the architect, James Gibbs. George Tilson, who had been undersecretary to Bolingbroke, came; Arthur Moore, who had been Prior's colleague on the Commission of Trade and Plantations, was represented by his son;¹² and Adrian Drift, who had long been Prior's faithful secretary, was apparently one of the most sincere mourners.¹³ There were also two young men in whose welfare the deceased had been interested—Robert Prior, who was perhaps a relative, and George Shelton, son of "Friend Dick."¹⁴

¹⁰ The Sub-Dean and Mr. Nicoll probably came in their official capacities. The others were all friends of Prior.

¹¹ Although Mr. Williamson's first name cannot be ascertained, he is surely the gentleman who was Prior's associate in 1712 (Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, Oxford, 1857, vi, 717) and who is named as a friend in Prior's correspondence for 1719 (Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, Vol. III, Hereford, 1907, pp. 474, 476).

¹² The list gives only "Mr. Moor, Junior." However, the only Moore with whom Prior was closely associated was his fellow commissioner of trade, who was arrested with him in 1715 (Historical MSS. Com., *Report on the MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, Vol. v, Norwich, 1899, p. 510). Prior had shown some interest in the verses of one of Arthur Moore's sons, perhaps James Moore (later Moore-Smythe) whom Pope called a dunce (*MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, III, 489-90).

¹³ Welbeck MS., ff. 10, 96v.

¹⁴ The poet had been interested in Robert Prior as early as the boy's

Some of the rest were neither eminent nor particularly intimate with Prior: a Mr. Gibson, who appeared as a substitute for John Morley, Lord Harley's agent; a Dr. Kenyon, perhaps one of the Kenyons who had been at St. John's with Prior;¹⁵ a Mr. Cunningham, who may be Alexander Cunningham, the medalist, a friend of the Earl of Oxford; a Mr. Thomas, probably a secretary attached to the Harley family;¹⁶ and a Mr. Bold about whom nothing is known.

When the time for interment came, the bier was taken up by twelve hired men in mourning and accompanied by the gentlemen pallbearers. Behind, in "universal silence," came the others. The forty King's scholars from Westminster School carried white wax tapers to light the way. In addition there were seventy men in mourning with branch-lights and a dozen almsmen with torches. Everyone there, both gentlemen and servants, had been given new gloves of chamois or kid. All the mourners had also received white taffeta favors; the six clergymen were wearing long silk scarves and flowing hatbands; and the pallbearers had "Black French Lustring Scarves Covered with Frisaneer."¹⁷ Solemnly, the procession passed from the Jerusalem Chamber into the church itself, where there were waiting many curious people to whom invitations had not been sent.¹⁸ It then proceeded the length of the nave, and turned into the east aisle of the south transept. The

graduation from Westminster School in 1713 (*Letters of Bolingbroke*, London, 1798, iv, 183-4, 199), and in 1721 was giving the young man indirect financial aid by paying him for the board of Drift's nephew (Welbeck MS., ff. 80v, 181v).

George Shelton was mentioned in *Alma*, Canto III, and Prior, in his will, left George £300 "to maintain Him . . . at the University, or to help Him in any trade or employment as his father may judge proper."

¹⁵ Three Kenyons are listed for 1681 and 1682 in *Admissions to the College of St. John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1893), II, 82, 86.

¹⁶ This may be the William Thomas who witnessed Prior's will. At any rate, he is probably either the Thomas to whom some of Prior's letters refer as if he were at Wimpole (*MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, III, 483, 492-93), or the William Thomas who was Lord Oxford's secretary (see *Hist. MSS. Com., Fifteenth Report*, Appendix, Pt. IV, London, 1897, pp. 483-484, 493, 521; *MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, v, 523, 617-18).

¹⁷ Welbeck MS., ff. 9v, 11.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 9v, 10.

organ played, the choir sang, the bells tolled; and the body was laid into its grave.¹⁹

After the ceremony, the company of mourners returned to Prior's house in Duke Street, which was marked with a hatchment by the door.²⁰ There, in rooms draped in mourning, servants in black served supper and wine while the undertaker's men had ale and beer at the Cock and at the Bottle.²¹ A few weeks later all who had attended and forty-two others received gold mourning rings engraved: "M. Prior. Ob: 18. Sep: 1721 AEtat. 57." These rings cost £73. 10s.; the fees at the Abbey were £60. 18s.; and the undertaker's bill was £138. 3s. 10d.—a total of £272. 11s. 10d.²² This, of course, was in addition to the £500 that Prior had set aside for the ornate monument designed by his friend Gibbs.

H. BUNKER WRIGHT

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

THE SOURCE OF ROBERT DABORNE'S *THE POOR-MANS COMFORT*

Comparatively little is known of the dramatist Robert Daborne, who wrote for Henslowe, was constantly in need of funds, and later "died amphibious by the ministry." Only two of his plays exist in print today,¹ one of them existing also in manuscript which is not, however, Daborne's original copy.

Swaen, in his edition of the two plays, discussed the source material of *A Christian turn'd Turke*, but stated that he had been unable to discover the source of *The Poor-Mans Comfort*, though he supposed the play to be founded on some story not of Daborne's own invention. I think it can now be clearly shown that Daborne found his story in William Warner's *Syrinx*, first published, probably in 1584, as *Pan His Syrinx*.² In 1597, in his preface to the

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ff. 10, 10v.

²¹ *Ibid.*, f. 79v.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 11.

²² *Ibid.*, ff. 11v, 12.

¹ *A Christian turn'd Turke*, published in 1612, and *The Poor-Mans Comfort*, published in 1655. The plays have been edited by A. E. H. Swaen: "Robert Daborne's Plays," *Anglia*, xx (1898), 153-256, and xxi (1899), 373-440. Swaen also reprints Daborne's correspondence with Henslowe.

² I hope before long to publish a new edition of Warner's tales, which have been rather undeservedly ignored.

second edition, called simply *Syrinx*, Warner made pointed remarks about more than one writer (unnamed) who had made bold to borrow from the 'seauenfold Historie,' sometimes copying verbatim and evidently without acknowledging any indebtedness to the author. It need not be supposed that Daborne, who died in 1628, had written *The Poor-Mans Comfort* as early as 1597; but a comparison of the play with *calamus septimus* in *Syrinx* proves that when he did write it he went to Warner for his plot.

Calamus septimus is the story of Opheltes, a rich and high-born gentleman of Lydia, who married and later forsook Alcippe, the gentle daughter of the poor countryman Philargus. In adapting the story for the stage, Daborne changed the location of the action, which in the play occurs in Arcadia and at the court of Thessaly—a change made probably to take advantage of the popularity of the land of shepherds in contemporary literature. The characters received different names: Opheltes became Lucius, Alcippe became Urania, Philargus became Gisbert, Phaemonoe (the prostitute for whom Opheltes deserted Alcippe) became Flavia. Otherwise, Warner's story is fundamentally the same as the plot of *The Poor-Mans Comfort*.

In both Warner and Daborne, an exiled courtier is pardoned when the rightful king of the country returns to power. During the period of exile, in each of the stories, this courtier has wooed and won the fair daughter of a poor but honest countryman, receiving with her the old man's substance as a dowry. When the period of exile is concluded, the courtier abandons his wife and makes off with his father-in-law's savings, whereupon the old man hastens to court to complain and to seek justice.

In the court, however, only injustice is to be found. The gentlemen justices turn a deaf ear to the countryman's pleas. Finally the old man reaches the king himself, and is rewarded when the king orders the seizure of Opheltes' property. A punishment of death (in the play) or banishment (in Warner) is suggested as a further penalty if within a period of a year (or, in the play, four days) Opheltes fails to find his wife, who has meanwhile disappeared from her father's home.

In both Warner and Daborne, Alcippe-Urania has taken this time to enter into the service of a prostitute, of whom Opheltes-Lucius is enamored. Hearing the sentence against her lover, the

prostitute now spurns the unhappy man. His wife, who is all the while disguised as a (female) servant, tries to keep him from committing suicide, and finally succeeds, by her show of devotion, in winning back his love. The prostitute comes upon husband and wife as they are being reconciled; in a rage at finding them thus, she attacks Alcippe-Urania and is slain by Opheltes-Lucius. Husband and wife are then seized and haled off to court where they are tried, as murderers, by old Philargus himself, who has meanwhile been made a judge. So just is the old man in his condemnation of the act of murder that the king joyously steps in to pardon the prisoners, whereupon a joyful reconciliation is effected.

Thus, point for point, Daborne borrows both story and moral from Warner's tale, filling in the outline of events and lending color to the line-drawings of characters. Many of the sentiments expressed by the disillusioned Gisbert in the court are drawn directly from *Opheltes*. Indeed, the playwright has simply set the action in dialogue for the stage. At two points, however, he makes interesting additions for theatrical effectiveness.³ He presents a rather telling scene in which Gisbert, left alone in the senate when the officials depart, takes the part of each senator in turn, giving their answers to his complaint and then crying out against them. He adds, too, an additional complication at the close when, after Gisbert's daughter and Lucius have been freed by the decision of the senator Vincentio, and at the entreaty of Gisbert himself, Gisbert remounts the bench and declares the two guilty of murder.

To this primary plot, however, Daborne has added another action concerning Sigismond, son of the king. *Opheltes* gives no hint of the story of Sigismond and the fair Adelizia, nor does it make use of Daborne's villainous Oswell, who attempts to ruin them. An examination of *calamus quintus* in *Syrinx*, however, shows that Daborne has elaborated here on Warner's story of Deipyrus, who, like Oswell, is nephew to the king and the usurper of his throne. Adelizia is drawn partly from Aphrodite, daughter of the king of Cilicia, and partly from the queen of Lydia, particularly from her flight into the forest where she is succored by Deipyrus, here filling

³ There are other additions, both in characters and in episodes. The supplying of the extra suitors of Urania, the use of the fellow Surdo for comic scenes, and the extension of Warner's outline for dramatic purposes constitute the real work of the playwright in this section of the action.

the rôle played by Alexis in the play. Sigismond is derived partly from Timaetes, who also loved the daughter of his father's ally; but the further misfortunes and death of Timaetes and Aphrodite, as told by Warner, have no place in Daborne's play. Catzo and the comedy scenes, as well as the fact of the prince's madness, have no parallel in *Syrinx*.⁴

The potpourri which forms the secondary plot of *The Poor-Mans Comfort* lacks the unity of the primary action. It is interesting to observe that the main plot of the play which Swaen found to represent the best of Daborne—a "plot of much interest, constructed with order and some ability," as he described it—owed its success largely to William Warner.

WALLACE A. BACON

University of Michigan

POLITICAL ELEMENTS IN CRITICISM OF VOLTAIRE IN ENGLAND 1732-47

Lucien Foulet has dealt very severely with the story that Voltaire was a spy in the pay of the English court.¹ Voltaire was, however, in one case unwillingly, in another wittingly, involved in English politics after his return to France. The first occasion was that of the publication of the *History of Charles XII*. The *Daily Courant*, was, it would appear, the first paper to seize on the opportunity of a book published by Bolingbroke's friend to attack Bolingbroke:²

A Method of criticising and answering Books has been lately introduced, whereby the Answerer supposes that the Treatise was written by some great Man, whom he abuses for 40 or 50 Pages together, and then calls it a *full Answer*, or a *proper Reply*.

The same Method he could observe in answering this Book, by calling it the Lord B—ke's.

⁴ Perhaps Daborne's title came from suggestions in the story. Philargus is more than once spoken of as "the poor man." At one point the king, speaking of the necessity for justice, says, "... in what therefore may we better discharge such our Charge, then in brideling the iawes of the mightie Oppressor, and in wiping teares from the eyes of the poore-man oppressed?" (Sig. Q4^r, ed. 1597.)

¹ *Correspondance de Voltaire (1726-1729)*, Paris, 1913, *Appendice VI*.

² March 6, 1732, *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 666.

The article goes on to paraphrase Voltaire's remark that the Pretender would have succeeded Queen Anne, "si son parti eût prévalu" by, "if the Party of Lord Ox—d and B—ke cou'd have prevailed." He is then accused of black ingratitude to George I. "However, his Ingratitude has no Excuse; but as it is a Copy of that brilliant Genius his Patron."

As was to be expected, the *Craftsman* also proceeded to use the book, but in order to attack the ministry.³ And in order to discredit the Hanoverian succession it flagrantly but cleverly misquoted Voltaire:

But notwithstanding this impartiality to the Duke of *Marlborough*, he has, in other Passages, misrepresented our Country; particularly with Relation to the *Swedish Conspiracy*, which he invidiously imputes to the Purchase which the Elector of *Hanover* made of *Bremen* and *Verden* from the K. of *Denmark*; and that this only cou'd prevail on the K. of *Sweden* to invade his Dominions, as *King of Great Britain*, whom he had never offended. This seems to squint at the *Act of Succession*; which was intended to secure us from Wars in Defence of *Foreign Dominions*, not belonging to the *Crown of England*.⁴

It is needless to add, that Voltaire makes quite clear the rôle that the Jacobite conspiracies played in the general situation, that he nowhere criticises the Hanoverian succession, that he treats George I more than justly, and that Charles' "pique" against George is adduced by him merely as one of the minor elements in the situation.

One phrase in particular suited the *Craftsman*'s purposes exceedingly well. In the opening *Discours* Voltaire said:

Les Anglais ne ressemblent pas plus aux Anglais de Cromwell que les moines et les monsignori dont Rome est peuplée ne ressemblent aux Scipions.

The *Craftsman*, whose constant thesis it was that Englishmen were

³ April 15, 1732, *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 701-2

⁴ Voltaire says: "(Gortz) remarqua que, de tant de princes réunis contre la Suède, George, électeur de Hanovre, roi d'Angleterre, était celui contre lequel Charles était le plus piqué, parce que c'était le seul que Charles n'eût point offensé; que George était entré dans la querelle sous prétexte de l'apaiser, et uniquement pour garder Brème et Verden, auxquels il semblait n'avoir d'autre droit que de les avoir achetés à vil prix du roi de Danemark, à qui ils n'appartenaient pas." Bengesco ed., Paris, 1890, II, 140-150.

degenerating as the result of the Hanoverian succession in general and the Walpole ministry in particular, interpreted this phrase in its own sense and advised the "Pensionary writers" to:

Consider, to whom such a reflection must fall, and to prove the Falseness of it; which will be the most effectual method of vindicating their *Master*.⁵

Thieriot apparently sent a copy of this *Craftsman* to Voltaire, who interpreted its purpose correctly, but was perturbed at the possible result of his phrase and in later editions corrected the second *Anglais* to read *Fanatiques*:

I thank you heartily for your charming letter and for the *Craftsman* you send me. I am not wholly displeased to see that my works are now and then the ground upon which the republicans point their artillery at the ministry: but never would I utter a single word that could be shocking to a free and generous nation which I admire, which I regret, and to whom I am indebted. It is to be imputed to the printer that these words are to be found in my preface: *les Anglais d'aujourd'hui ne ressemblent pas aux Anglais de Cromwell*. He should have printed, *aux fanatiques de Cromwell*; and thus it is to be read in the errata and in the late editions. I entreat you therefore to clear me from that aspersion, for your friend's and for truth's sake.⁶

The "Pensionary writers" were not deceived either as to the purpose of the *Craftsman*'s review. The *Daily Courant* replied with the remark that:

Mr. Danvers's Design in recommending this History is to make the Abuse of his late Majesty pass the better, viz. That he look'd on himself rather as Elector of Hanover, than as King of England.⁷

Finally, in May 1732 came the article in the *London Journal* which Churton Collins quoted in his study of Voltaire in England:⁸

It is no wonder that a *Frenchman* should be *partial* in his Characters of the *English Nation*, especially after having enrich'd himself with our Contributions he behaved so ill, that he was refus'd Admittance into those Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Families, in which he had been received with great marks of Favour and Distinction. He left *England* full of Resent-

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁶ Paris, May 13, 1732, Moland, *xxxiii*, 264.

⁷ April 20, 1732, *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 702-3.

⁸ May 6, 1732, *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 739, quoted by Churton Collins, *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England*, 109.

ment, and wrote the K. of *Sweden's* Life to abuse this Nation and the Hanover Family.

Churton Collins was quite right when he characterized the *London Journal's* statement as follows, "The latter statement is, we need scarcely say, quite untrue; the former statement is as plainly a gross exaggeration." What he missed was the fact that the story, coming at the end of such a controversy, was merely a typical pamphleteer's effort to discredit Bolingbroke. In the heat of battle the *Free Briton* of April 20 had already characterized either Voltaire or "D'Anvers"—the sentence is ambiguous—as, "One of these little Prostitutes."⁹ *Reed's Journal* proceeded placidly to print Voltaire's book in serial fashion throughout all this quarrel and after it.¹⁰

Ten years later the situation had entirely changed. France was at war with Austria, and England trembling on the verge of war with France. The two latter were engaged in a bitter diplomatic struggle for the sympathy of the Netherlands. At the head of the pro-Austrian party among the Dutch was William van Haren, a considerable literary figure, an admirer and disciple of Voltaire's.¹¹ The latter, as is well known, hoped to convert Van Haren to the French point of view by a judicious mixture of literary and political flattery.¹² The English were well aware of what was going on and in response to Voltaire's *Ode to the Queen of Hungary*, Samuel Boyse¹³ published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for July 1742¹⁴ an *Ode addressed to M. Voltaire* to which he prefixed the following paragraph:

⁹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 703-4.

¹⁰ *Gentleman's Magazine*, II, 715-16, 757-60, 809-10, April, May, June, 1732.

¹¹ For a short account of Van Haren as well as a discussion of his debt to Voltaire's *Henriade* see H. J. Minderhoud, *La Henriade dans la Littérature Hollandaise*, Paris, 1927, 87 ff.

¹² See Voltaire's letters in August 1743, especially August 8, to D'Argenson, August 16, to Amelot, August 16, to Thieriot. There is a good discussion of Voltaire's activities in the Netherlands at this time in P. Valkhoff and J. Fransen's article, *Voltaire en Hollande* (Part 2), *La Revue de Hollande*, II, Jan.-July 1916, 1071 ff.

¹³ Dublin-born poetaster, 1708-49. He published a number of translations from the French and Dutch, including one of Voltaire's *Épître au Roi de Prusse* (Moland X, 311-12), *Gentleman's Magazine*, X, 406, August, 1740.

¹⁴ XII, 383.

I was greatly disappointed on reading M. Voltaire's ode, published last month at the Hague in praise of the Queen of Hungary, for I expected it would have answered the title by giving us some idea of the glorious character of that august princess—instead of which I found only a wild panegyrick on his own nation and some well turn'd compliments to Cardinal Fleury. If therefore you think the following stanzas to that gentleman on this occasion worth inserting, I may perhaps next month trouble you with a poem that will do more justice to her Hungarian majesty.

By his statement of the issue in terms of Lord Stair, Aremberg, Fleury, and Van Haren in the two following stanzas of his poem, Boyse makes quite clear that it is purely the political issue with which he is dealing:

But while you sing the sweets of peace
To *Fleury* spare the fond address,
Such praise is lost in air!
We *Britons* better far than you,
Know where our grateful thanks are due
To *Aremberg* and *Stair*.

And the final stanza:

I have like you a light in view!
But faith no *Fleury* or *Richelieu*.
Tho' two I think as good.
And when I praise *Van Haren's* name,
Or speak of *Stair's* eternal fame
Believe me understood.

Flattery of Van Haren was underlined by the publication on the same page of a translation of his ode, *Aan de Groot-Brittanische Natie*, and a translation of his own *Ode to the Queen of Hungary* appeared a few months later.¹⁵ Voltaire's ode was not printed in the *Gentleman's*, though Edward Cave apparently published a translation in his *Miscellaneous Correspondence*.¹⁶

Strangely enough, the laudatory *Stances* that Voltaire addressed to Van Haren, which date from one year later, when he was at the Hague,¹⁷ were not noted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* until 1745,

¹⁵ *Gentleman's Magazine*, XII, 656, XIII, 43 December 1742, January 1743. It was probably translated by Boyse—see concluding sentence of his paragraph above and ascription by C. L. Carlson, *The First Magazine*, Providence, 1933, 246.

¹⁶ See notice in *Gentleman's Magazine*, XII, 608, November, 1742. The list of contents gives as numbers XI and XII, *M. Voltaire on Suicide and His Ode to the Queen of Hungary*.

¹⁷ See his letter to Thieriot, August 16, 1743, Moland, XXXVI, 234-5,

when a very poor translation appeared in January,¹⁸ clearly based upon the version printed in the well-known and extremely anti-Voltarian article of the *Bibliothèque Française*, for, among other indications, it follows the Dutch version of *Liberty* rather than *Truth* marching before Van Haren's steps.¹⁹ Another and better translation appeared, along with the French text (still conserving *Liberté* in the second verse) in February 1747.²⁰ It is more than probable that these publications were motivated by the events of the war, though positive proof is lacking.²¹ At any rate, enough evidence has, I think, been shown to make it clear that in dealing with

¹⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, xv, 48.

¹⁹ *Bibliothèque Française*, xxxvii, 111-118. A note appended to the translation in the *Gentleman's* refers to one of the criticisms levelled at Voltaire's *Stances* by the Dutch journal. In the version printed in that journal, the second verse reads:

"L'auguste *Liberté* marche devant tes pas" and so did the version printed by Van Haren in the 1758 edition of his epic, *De Gevallen van Friso*.

Apparently there is a Dutch tradition of this little poem separate from the French. In both Moland (viii, 514) and Bengesco (*Oeuvres choisies, Poesies*, Paris, 1889) the word is *Vérité*. I note that Valkhoff and Fransen (*op. cit.*) still follow the Dutch version.

These latter also draw attention to a much wider variant discovered originally by Jeronimo de Vries, and since it is apparently still not widely known it may be worth quoting De Vries' own statement, from his *Dichterlijke Werken van Willem en Onno Zuier van Haren*, Amsterdam, 1824, i, 20. He says that among other Van Haren manuscripts he found:

Naauwkerige kopij van het vers van Willem van Haren, naar het oorspronkelijk Handschrift van Voltaire.

Met het algemeen bekende, en door W. van Haren uitgegevene, verschilt het Handschrift hier in, dat in het tweede couplet in plaats van:

Je ne peux t'imiter &c staat Je ne t'imité point en in het derde in plaats van't bekende

A Rome on est esclave, à Londres citoyen

La grandeur d'un Batave est de vivre sans maître

Et mon premier devoir est de servir le mien

gelezen wordt

Tout état a ses mœurs, tout homme a son lien

Ta gloire, ta vertu est de vivre sans maître

Et mon premier devoir est de chérir le mien.

Valkhoff and Fransen state that Voltaire, "modifia *plus tard* les derniers vers," but I do not know on what authority. *A priori* this would seem to be an earlier version.

²⁰ *Gentlemen's Magazine*, xvii, 97.

²¹ It was on January 8, 1745, that the Quadruple Alliance was formed,

Voltaire's reputation in England during the eighteenth century it is advisable to keep in mind both domestic and foreign political situations.

ROGER B. OAKE

Brown University

VOLTAIRE. *LE PATRIOT INSULAIRE*

The London *Public Advertiser* of Nov. 27, 1759, contains the following detailed notice of *Le Patriot (sic) Insulaire*, a play by Voltaire which, under that title at least, is entirely unknown to the scholars and bibliographers who have interested themselves in M. Arouet. Here is the notice:

Geneva, Nov. 6.—Two days after the news arrived here of the taking of Quebec (*by Wolfe*), Monsieur de Voltaire gave a grand entertainment at his house in the country. In the evening the company retired into a noble gallery, at the end of which was erected an elegant theatre, and a new piece called *Le Patriot Insulaire* was performed, in which all the genius and fire of that celebrated poet were exhausted in the cause of liberty. M de Voltaire himself appeared in the principal character, and drew tears from the whole audience. The scenes were decorated with emblems of liberty, and over the stage with this inscription in Latin and English—

‘Libertati quieti
Musis Sacrum
S P of the F.’

The English line means ‘Spite of the French.’

After the play the windows of the gallery flew open and presented a spacious court finely illuminated and adorned with savage trophies. In the middle of the court a magnificent firework was played off, accompanied with martial music; the star of St. George shedding forth innumerable rockets, and underneath a lively representation by girandoles of the cataract of Niagara.

In spite of the fact that neither Voltaire nor anyone else, except the *Public Advertiser*, mentions *Le Patriot Insulaire*, it is hardly credible that Voltaire composed and acted a play in 1759 that has remained unknown until 1941!

What, then, was this play in which, as the “principal character,” Voltaire “drew tears from the whole audience,” and in which he “exhausted” all his genius and fire “in the cause of liberty?”

while in the early months of 1747 Marshal Saxe was successfully invading the Netherlands.

Probably it was *Tancrède*.¹ This was a "new piece," the first draft having been made in May, 1759. Voltaire refers to it frequently in his correspondence of the following summer and fall, and for a long time he was uncertain about the title, calling it simply his *Chevalerie*.

On Nov. 1 he writes that it has been played three times at his private theater, and it is probably to one of these performances that the notice in the *Advertiser* refers. If it was played two days after the news came of the fall of Quebec, that could not be later than Oct. 30, for Voltaire mentions the latter in a letter of Oct. 28.

Both Tancrède and old Argire—the rôle that Voltaire says he took—are patriotic Sicilians; thus either might be called "le patriote insulaire." The spectator whose report inspired the notice, impressed by Voltaire's personality, may well have considered his rôle the principal one. Liberty is referred to several times in the first scene of the play, and the tears would have flowed appropriately over Argire-Voltaire's grief at the end of the performance.

The references to St. George, Niagara, and the "savage trophies," have to do with what followed the play, and would seem to have been suggested by the fall of Quebec and Voltaire's hostility to the French government.

ROBERT E. PIKE

Great Bend, Pa.

VOLTAIRE TO MAZZUCHELLI

On June 4, 1762, Voltaire wrote at least four letters from Les Délices (*Œuvres complètes*, ed. Moland, XLII, letters 4916-4919). A fifth, hitherto unpublished, so far as I know, and of such scant interest as to be unworthy of publication except for its authorship, is to be found in a manuscript in the Vatican library, Vat. lat. 10013, fol. 37. This manuscript contains a miscellaneous collection of correspondence addressed to Count Giovanni Maria (Giam-maria) Mazzuchelli of Brescia, an erudite collector and man of letters, interested in biographical and scientific research, who wrote among other things a famous life of Aretino and was apparently engaged up to the time of his death in compiling his great bio-

¹For the suggestion of this theory and for the following information about *Tancrède*, the writer is indebted to Professor H. C. Lancaster.

graphical dictionary, *Gli scrittori d'Italia*. The Vatican library contains a large amount of material, much of it unpublished, that formerly belonged to him.

What work Mazzuchelli may have sent Voltaire we do not know, nor did he ever write anything that could conceivably have influenced Voltaire in the period of his life that produced the *Pucelle* and the *Traité sur la tolérance*. In this letter, as in so many others and indeed in two others of the same date, Voltaire complains of his ill health. The superscription and signature are in his own hand and the seal shows his armorial bearings, but the descriptive addition to the signature, as well as the rest of the letter, is probably due to his secretary Wagnière (cf. Moland XLII, letter 5035):

A Monsieur, Monsieur Mazzuchelli, A Brescia, Lombardia.

Aux Delices, par Genève 4^e Juin 1762

J'étais très malade, Monsieur, lorsque je reçus l'honneur de votre Lettre et votre dissertation, je suis encor dans un état bien douloureux; il m'empêche de vous répondre de ma main, mais il ne m'empêche pas de sentir tout votre mérite, j'y suis aussi sensible qu'au plaisir que m'a fait votre ouvrage pardonnez à un pauvre malade, s'il ne vous dit pas avec plus d'étendue combien il vous estime. J'ai l'honneur d'être avec tous les sentiments qui vous sont dus, Monsieur, votre très humble et très obeissant serviteur

Voltaire gentilhomme ord[inaire] de la chombre du roy

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

FR. *mitant* 'THE MIDDLE,' 'THE HALF'

This word was the occasion of a prolonged dialogue between A. Horning, *ZRPh* IX, 141; xv, 563; xviii, 224 and P. Marchot, *ZRPh* xvi, 383; xviii, 433. The REW seems to espouse the stymon of Horning; *medium tempus*, presumably because of the numerous -ē- forms in Eastern French dialects. The **medietantem* of Puitspelu, favored by Marchot, has to face a morphological objection (*medietas* > VL **medietare* > participle **medietente*: analogy with *pendente* in the dialects with -ē-?). But it seems to me that a form like *mitantier* 'doigt moyen' (the middle finger would then be a 'meantime finger'??), and O. Wallon *demeytant que*, *en(tre)metant que*, 'pendant que' (where *tempus* > *tems* with -ē-) do not concord with *medium tempus*. Dauzat in his recent

Dictionnaire étymologique says: "A. Thomas considérait le mot comme l'équivalent du prov. *meitadenc*, mais n'a pas publié cette étym. qui lui laissait des doutes" — and rightly so, since in contrast to the O. Fr. *moitaenc* of the 13th century which Thomas himself retraced, along with O. Prov. *meitadenc*, to a *medietas* + *-ing*, we have no traces of trisyllabism in *mitant* attested since the 14th century. Dauzat is noncommittal about the origin but says: "un comp.[osé] de *mi* et *tant* est plus plausible" [than **medietantem*]. Now Marchot, after having suggested in his first article that *mitant* = *en mitant* ('meanwhile') with *tantum* as in Ital. *frat-tanto*, had, in the following one (still holding to the idea of an *-an-* etymon), considered for a moment the possibility of a *medium tantum* analogous to *autant* = *aliud tantum*. This, however, he discards in favor of the fantastic **medietantem* because "le processus sémasiologique [in the case of a *medium tantum*] n'est pas très compréhensible: *medium* à lui seul suffit pour le sens de milieu et *tantum* est une redondance; au contraire, dans des mots comme *autant*, *pourtant*, *partant*, il a sa signification propre et très importante." It is significant that the principle *simplex sigillum veri* did not obtain in the treatment of morphological questions in this earlier period of Romance etymology: Marchot thought it more difficult to explain a *medium tantum* on semasiological grounds than a **medietantem* morphologically.

I am personally convinced that *medium tantum* is the right explanation, and that *tantum* is not at all redundant: one must remember that in O. Fr. *deus tanz*, *set tanz*, *cent tanz* etc. are the substitutes of Latin *proportionalia* ending in *-plex* (cf. Tobler, *V. B.* I, 176), and that these formations, represented also in other Romance languages, occur already in Latin: *bis tantum*, *sexcenta tanta*. Thus an O. Fr. *deus tanz* means 'twice as much' — why should not **medium tantum*, then, mean 'half as much'? Le *mitant du jour, de la montagne* (Pierrehumbert) is then equal to *la moitié du jour, de la montagne*, and from 'the half' one comes to 'the middle.' One can explain the dwindling of this rather popular *mitant* after the 16th century in the academic language, after the multiplicative formed with *tant* disappeared. O. Fr. *ce tant*, *autretant* also disappeared, while in Italian *quel tanto*, *altrettanto* remained (cf. Eng. 'this much'). In the Horning-Marchot debate the phonetic issue was overstressed: it is obvious that in a *medium tantum* > O. Fr. *mitant*, *moitant*, used temporally

in *demeytant que* (litt. 'in the middle' > 'meanwhile'), a *temps* = *tempus* could be understood by popular etymology (cf. *entretant* > *entre-temps*).¹ All kinds of transpositions of sounds are possible when the *langue académique* intervenes in the *patois*. Similarly, Meyer-Lübke, basing himself on a dialect form with -*ē*- in *Damprichard*, had given in the first edition of his REW a Latin *contente* as etymology for Fr. *payer comptant*; but in the third edition, giving way to my protest, he replaced this by the semantically obvious *computare*. In the case of Fr. *danser* the FEW accepted an etymology **dintjan* because of -*ē*- forms which M. Bruch had found in Eastern dialects, but M. Bruch himself later had to retract this phonetic argument. Former periods of Romance etymology had a tendency to trust phonetics more than morphology, and to prefer construction to thinking over semasiological possibilities: a bold construction (**medietante*) was offered, and the simple *medium tantum* disdained.

LEO SPITZER

BARNABE BARNES' USE OF GEOFFREY FENTON'S *HISTORIE OF GUICCIARDIN*

Barnabe Barnes' *The Devil's Charter* (1607) is made up of two distinct elements, the historical and the legendary. By introducing Francesco Guicciardini as a chorus, Barnes gives the source of the history. R. B. McKerrow has pointed out in his Introduction to the play that Barnes probably made use of Fenton's *The Historie of Guicciardin*, translated in 1579 from the French version of Jérôme Chomedey, rather than of the Italian original.¹ Mc-

¹ An expression analogous to *mitant* = *medium tantum* would be **demtant*, in case this were the original phonetic spelling of a *demu-temps*; Godefroy attests for the year 1377: *la moitié d'un bréviaire, qui est appelé demitemps* (= *dimidium tantum*?), but in 1446 it was probably understood as 'half-time': "Item un volume de breviaire de *demitemps*. C'est assavoir du temps d'esté." — Mod. prov. *mitan* 'milieu, moitié' seems to be borrowed from Fr.

² *The Devil's Charter*, ed. R. B. McKerrow (Louvain, 1904), p. vi. The first sixteen books of Guicciardini's *Storia d'Italia* were published in 1561, the last four books, in 1564. Chomedey's French translation was published in 1568, and republished with corrections in 1577. From Chomedey's French version Fenton drew the English *Historie* of 1579. A second edition appeared in 1599, and a third with some additional matter in 1608.

GRAY AND CHRISTOPHER SMART

Though Gray's acquaintance with Christopher Smart is familiar to the biographers of both men, the possibility of literary influence between the two has been ignored. This may be due to lack of evidence that Smart paid much attention to Gray's work and to the patronizing tone of Gray's references to Smart.¹ Apparently, however, Gray was indebted to the *Song to David* in several lines of the "Ode for Music":

Sweet is the breath of vernal shower,
The bee's collected treasures sweet,
Sweet music's melting fall, but sweeter yet
The still small voice of Gratitude. (61-64)

In both image and rhetoric, these lines are strikingly similar to the italicized phrases in this passage of the *Song to David*:

*Sweet is the dew that falls betimes,
And drops upon the leafy limes; . . .
Sweet the musician's ardour beats,
While his vague mind's in quest of sweets,
The choicest flow'rs to hve.*

Sweeter in all the strains of love,
The language of thy turtle dove,
Pair'd to thy swelling chord;
Sweeter with ev'ry grace endu'd,
The glory of thy gratitude,
Respir'd unto the Lord. (427 ff.)

At the end of the *Song* are five groups of stanzas like the one just quoted in part; each contains several statements beginning with the positive degree of an adjective (e. g., *sweet*) and ending with one that has the comparative degree of the same adjective (i. e., *sweeter*).² One cannot fail to be struck by the prominence of this rhetorical device; nor can one miss the fact that Gray uses the same pattern.

The similarity of idea in the two passages strengthens the suspi-

¹ *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. Toynbee and Whibley (Oxford, 1935), I, 273 ff., 291 f., 315; II, 603 f., 803.

² A passage in *Paradise Lost* (IV, 641 ff.), somewhat similar in content to those under discussion, lacks this distinctive rhetorical pattern.

cion of borrowing which the climactic succession of *sweet, sweet, sweet, sweeter* awakens. "The dew that falls . . . upon the leafy limes" might well suggest "the breath of vernal showers," especially to Gray, to whom "the language of the age is never the language of poetry." Gray's literal allusions to the sweetness of honey and music present the same ideas as Smart's metaphor, based on the bee's quest for honey. Finally, the sweetness of gratitude is the climax of each series, and, in each, the order of the images is approximately the same. It is difficult to believe these marked similarities a coincidence.

The direction of the borrowing, if such there was, is clear. The *Song* was first published in 1763 and appeared next in the 1765 edition of Smart's version of the Psalms, to which Gray was a subscriber. The "Ode for Music" was composed after the Duke of Grafton had appointed Gray to the professorship of modern languages and history in 1768 and had himself been elected Chancellor of the University in 1769. Gray wrote his poem from a sense of gratitude and duty; to judge from his letters at the time, he did the work unwillingly and perhaps in some haste. Under the circumstances, he might well have stimulated his powers by reference now and then to poetry which was familiar to him.

ROLAND B. BOTTING

State College of Washington

A NEW POEM BY MRS. CENTLIVRE

The periodical-miscellany *Caribbeana* printed on 6 September 1732 the following poem by Mrs. Centlivre which has gone unnoticed by Centlivre editors:

SIR,

The Favour I ask you'll with Honour supply,
A *Whig* and a *Woman* you cannot deny;
Then once for a Stranger your Int'rest pray use,
Bring your Friends, with yourself, to honour my Muse.
No *Tory* I sue to, my *Play* to support,
For I hate all the Rogues, from the *Cit* to the *Court*.
In Times worse than these, I chose firmly to stand,

By those that supported the Laws of the Land,
 And now my Ambition is, only, to bring,
 The Props of my Country, and the Friends of my King¹

The accompanying letter explains the circumstances under which the poem was written:

Bridge-Town [Barbadoes]. The . . . Lines were wrote *extempore*, by the celebrated Female Poet . . . in a Letter to a Person of known Generosity (now residing here) on Occasion of a new Play of the Author's, which was to be acted the same Evening, for her Benefit. As they were never before in Print, it may be some Gratification to the *Curious*, to see the *hasty* Thoughts of so famous a *Wit* of that Sex.

The poem must have been composed between 1714, the accession of George I, and 1723, the death of Mrs. Centlivre. Genest reports two benefit performances given for her during that period but neither is on the occasion of a new play.² *Caribbeana*, an obscure and neglected work, also contains what appears to be the first tribute in print to John Dyer's "Grongar Hill" (August 13, 1734).³

RICHARD C. BOYS

University of Michigan

CARLYLE ON CONTEMPORARY STYLE

Readers of Professor Gregory Paine's important article, "The Literary Relations of Whitman and Carlyle with Especial Reference to Their Contrasting Views on Democracy,"¹ will be interested in material which gives further proof of the literary relationship between Carlyle and Whitman.

Immediately after the financially unsuccessful publication of the first issue of the *Leaves of Grass* in July, 1855, Whitman began to

¹ *Caribbeana. Containing Letters and Dissertations, Together With Poetical Essays. . . . Chiefly Wrote by several hands in the West-Indies* (1741), I, 48 I am indebted to Mr. Stanley Gwynn, of the Newberry Library, Chicago, for a transcript of this poem.

² *Some Account of the English Stage* (Bath, 1832), II, 554

³ I, 372-4. Reprinted in part in *Grongar Hill*, by John Dyer, ed. R. C. Boys, Johns Hopkins Press, 1941, p. 30.

⁴ *SP*, xxxvi (1939), 550-563.

prepare for the second issue of the same edition. He did this by including a section of "Press Notices" in the back of the unsold copies of the first issue.² In addition to printing portions of several reviews of the *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman also inserted lengthy quotations from articles whose substance offered encouragement to the type of stylistic and subjective experiment which the *Leaves of Grass* embodied. One selection, urging the establishment of a national literature, came from E. P. Whipple's famous review of Griswold's *Poets and Poetry of America*; ³ another, from an article in the *London Eclectic Review*, "Have Great Poets Become Impossible"; the third, which justified the poet's departure from the conventional style of contemporary verse, Whitman borrowed from Carlyle:

SWELFUNGUS REDIVIVUS, throwing
down his critical assaying-
balance, some years ago, and
taking leave of the Belles-
Lettres function, expressed
himself in this abrupt way:
"The end having come, it is fit
that we end Poetry having
ceased to be read, or published,
or written, how can it continue
to be reviewed?"

Though Whitman does not give the source of this borrowing, it may be found in the introductory paragraph of the "Corn-Law Rhymes." It is possible that Whitman owned a copy of the Carey and Hart edition of Carlyle which Emerson had helped to publish in 1845, for the "Corn-Law Rhymes," originally published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1832, was one of the essays which had been made more accessible to American readers by inclusion in the volume.

JOSEPH JAY RUBIN

The Pennsylvania State College

² A perfect copy of this second issue is in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

³ *North American Review*, LVIII (1844), 1-39.

A POEM WRONGLY ATTRIBUTED TO SIDNEY

In Sir Philip Sidney's *Works* (II, 342), edited by Albert Feuillerat, there is among the poems attributed to Sidney one of nine lines from R. Allot's *English Parnassus*, p. 313. The name S. Ph. Sydney appears at the end of the poem. However, as Crawford indicates in a note in his edition of Allot (Oxford, 1913, p. 495), the supposed poem is a stanza from Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (5. 5. 25), and has no place among works now to be attributed to Sir Philip.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

REVIEWS

The Shakespeare Documents, Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations & Commentary. By B. ROLAND LEWIS. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1940. Two folio volumes. Pp. i-xxiv + 1-324; i-xi + 325-631. \$35.00.

Professor Lewis states his aims and accomplishments thus:

In this work, the manuscripts have been brought together in a compact and organic whole.

Here are presented the rare original Shakespeare documents (a) in new and original transcripts, (b) with English translations of the often difficult Renaissance Latin, (c) printed not as short excerpts but *in extenso*, (d) arranged in chronological order, and (e) critically edited. Generally, material relating only to those poems and plays which were actually printed during the dramatist's natural lifetime has been included. Finally, (f) extensive critical bibliographies are appended to each important documentary discussion.

These new transcripts are as far as possible original, independent, and prepared directly from the actual manuscripts in their several repositories and from full-size photographs executed especially for this undertaking. . . . Paleographical details and discussion have been included only when needed for clarity and for the justifying of a given transcript reading.

Professor Lewis lists 276 documents, and has under the title of Illustrations and Facsimiles 59 separate headings. One wishes the documents of any real value had all been produced in facsimile, especially all the manuscripts. For such a note as that Robert Arden's will is not now forthcoming is an ominous warning. It is fortunate that Professor Lewis has reproduced some of these manuscripts before it was too late. Would that he had centered his

energies upon thus preserving all! Even though no facsimile can ever replace an original, it is far better than a transcript. While the reviewer has no adequate means of testing these facsimiles against their originals, they are usually legible and appear generally to be of an acceptable standard for such things.

At the outset, it is puzzling to know what were the standards, never defined, of inclusion and exclusion as a document, and of reproduction in facsimile. The Disputed Revels Accounts are not even documents, but entries concerning plays in the Stationers' Registers are. One wonders also why Professor Lewis felt it necessary to include so fully so much supplementary material that can be better obtained and used in other forms. After Stamp's reproduction, there would be no point, of course, in a full reproduction of the Disputed Revels Accounts in a collection of documents such as this; a note would probably do, though we do not get even that. In contrast, a great amount of space is taken with compiling issues and locations of quartos. Bartlett was sufficient already, and Greg in his *Bibliography* has now produced the kind of uncluttered standard work which shows painfully the shortcomings of the similar compilations by Professor Lewis, though the latter may have added some points from personal observations, mostly at the Folger Library.

The facsimiles appear to be at least fair. The transcriptions of them are frequently the best yet available, though by no means impeccable. Unfortunately, Professor Lewis eschews "Paleographical details and discussion." The transcript of Richard Hathaway's will is only "virtually literal" (p. 156), and in fact was done by someone who had no ability at reading Elizabethan script, being full of errors. Professor Lewis is puzzled by a word in the entry of the marriage license to Shakspeare in 1582, deciding for *similis* with Fripp against the field (p. 161). The dot of the first *i* appears to show in Gray's facsimile, to which he refers, as it certainly does in the next entry, where only the tops of the letters happen to be reproduced. A glance at the surrounding entries either in original or in facsimile would determine the point, but Professor Lewis has not glanced and has not provided us the means of glancing. Incidentally, Gray's facsimile of the marriage license bond is very much clearer than that of Professor Lewis, since the document has faded, but that hardly accounts for the half-dozen or so minor errors in the transcription of the English alone (p. 164-5).

Again, Professor Lewis points out concerning the preliminary draft for a coat of arms, 1596, "No study of this document is complete unless especial attention is devoted to the erasures and interlineations" (p. 208). But unless the reader can follow the Elizabethan handwriting with some degree of accuracy in the first place, he will not be able to follow the transcript of some of the

most important of these "erasures and interlineations" in the second. For instance, it is clear that one of these passages was intended to read, "*at all tym[es] convenient [to] beare [&] make shewe of the same Blazon or Atchevem[en]t on theyre Shield[és],*" but the interlineations, italicized in the quotation, are all run together in the transcript as if they were only one interlineation, so that the reader could have no way of knowing what part belongs to which caret, one of which is not transcribed at that. There is no way of knowing how Professor Lewis would read the passage, even though except for the missing caret, failure to indicate a couple of expansions, and failure to catch a missing "[&]" he has an accurate transcription of the individual symbols—a feat incidentally which required considerable expertness on the part of someone. However this occasional mixture of high and very low paleographical expertness happened, the scholar will need to be on his guard against it in using these transcriptions.

Upon occasion Professor Lewis may also warn that "The English translation is not exactly literal, but is more exact than a mere free rendering" (p. 395). But in a work of this character why not a literal translation? Again the scholar must be on guard. One wishes Professor Lewis had paid more attention to "Paleographical details and discussion," and had given an adequate number of facsimiles, completely accurate transcripts, and, wherever pertinent, literal translations, of all manuscript documents of the slightest importance. This was the actual need.

But the real interest of Professor Lewis was elsewhere. He continues: "William Shakespeare took the impress of his age. He was in no sense a thing apart from his time. The present editing, consequently, comprises, in one way or another, (a) the legal nature of the document, (b) its historical-political background, (c) religious factors, (d) family considerations, (e) racial inheritance, (f) literary and theater tendencies, and (g) biographical significances." It may as well be said at once. Exceedingly few men have ever lived who could execute this complete scheme with any outstanding degree of success, and Professor Lewis has not proved himself to be one of them, even though he has obviously spent a great deal of time and money upon his undertaking. There is again the mixture of occasional high glimpses above the dead level, but even more frequent abysmal lapses.

The reader would probably find useful the itemized summaries which Professor Lewis has given of the involved legal documents, if these summaries could only be found readily in the surrounding mass. A brief explanation of "the legal nature of the document," and perhaps even of "its historical-political background" occasionally, is also desirable. But when one is considering Shakspeare's case, why must he argue the question of whether Adam (p. 375) was required to pay tithes? And why must one begin with the

Anglo-Saxons (p. 263) for a "history of taxation in England before 1600" (p. 270) in order to explain Shakspeare's taxes, especially when one never examines the actual statutes by which Shakspeare's taxes were levied? And one does not want a compilation on the general subject anyway; he wants the critical statement of an expert on the particular point. No quantity of compilation can replace expert quality.

The remaining heads are of doubtful pertinence, even if Professor Lewis were expert enough to supply them. If one had nothing else to do, he might be amused to have a sermon on Shakspeare as a moral teacher "to this very day," wrapped up in a lengthy disquisition on the Elizabethan attitude toward Jews, bonds, etc., ending with judgment from the "Christian point of view" (pp. 314-15)—or in reading the record of the baptism of Elizabeth Hall, being in Stratford Church, he might even keep decorum when Professor Lewis whispers in his ear, "She must have been a sweet child" (p. 388)—; but what is the pertinence of all this to "documents" and who can be expected to take it seriously? It can certainly not be religious prejudice which causes Simon Hunt to remain a school-master in Stratford 1571-7, and at the same time to go abroad in 1575 to become a Catholic priest (pp. 106-7)—no doubt, after he or someone else had given William an "even meticulously intimate acquaintance" with the Geneva Bible, "not the King James version of 1611, as the uninformed often so enthusiastically proclaim" (p. 109). But has Professor Lewis himself read Noble's work on *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge*? At least, it is not in his bibliography to the section. And what are we to think of the technical competence of one who praises Plimpton's pamphlet, which is in his bibliography, as "an excellent analysis of the Grammar School curriculum of Shakespeare's day" (p. 111)?

One may be equally impressed by such a statement on literary problems as that *3 Henry VI* of the First Folio is "clearly a revision" (p. 203) of the *True Tragedy* and that "Scholars are now pretty much in agreement that William Shakespeare had no hand whatever in writing any part of the original *Contention* or of the original *True Tragedy*" (p. 205), etc. Was this written before Professor Lewis read the work of Peter Alexander, whose articles are listed in the accompanying bibliography? The recantation of Sir Edmund Chambers in 1930, duly referred to in his bibliography, should have warned him to examine the last dozen or so years carefully on this point. But even at that a counting of noses down the ages is neither critical nor analytical; it is merely "political."

The reviewer finds nothing to indicate any unusual expertness on the part of Professor Lewis in any of these classifications, and even if there were, one would probably still prefer not to have them bury so completely the "documents." One gets frightfully bored by all these elementary compilations of critical lumber

from yet other compilations. Also, small errors of proofreading and of fact are annoyingly frequent; someone consistently read the French word "Masque" in the title of Lefranc's book as "Mosque," and the German titles also suffer occasionally—but at least we may be thankful that the Germans have not also been compiled. Perhaps the compilation on John Shakspeare comes nearest to being worth while, but it should have been used for a separate biography as Professor Lewis apparently himself suspects. Where the discussions require common sense rather than any particular critical expertness, and where common sense is not interfered with by some sentimental quirk, the discussions are passable. But throughout, Professor Lewis has erred on the side of inclusion. With the agglutinative genius of a mediaeval compiler he has managed to find a place to attach somewhere about every fact or opinion which has appealed to him, and thereby has overwhelmed what might have been a distinguished contribution to scholarship.

The huge compilation of facts on the spelling of the family name may serve in illustration as well as any. Professor Lewis speaks of "Shakespeare's own six autograph signatures" here, but does not give references for them. If one turns to the Index entry, under "Signatures," he finds no reference to lead him to the two Blackfriars signatures at all and only one to indicate that a facsimile of any signature is to be had in his work. But elsewhere he speaks of Shakspeare's "seven extant genuine signatures" (p. 433). Presumably, therefore, he accepts the signature in Montaigne's *Essays* as genuine. In this section, however, he merely mentions that signature under the spelling Shaksper. If Professor Lewis reads no final e in that signature, then he should have told us why he manages to do so in the three will signatures. Incidentally, there is no reference to this signature under "Signatures" in the Index, and Montaigne has no entry there. This is not an infrequent situation. There is no really systematic arrangement of classifications under the separate headings, and no sufficient index for such a complicated work. So if one should wish to locate anything he must frequently read till he finds it—and may luck be with him!

But to continue, it is highly questionable whether the Bellot-Mountjoy signature can be fairly quoted under this spelling Shaksper, since the final syllable is admittedly an abbreviation. But if it can, then why should not the Blackfriars signatures be quoted under Shakspeare? If there be thus much doubt here as to the exact forms of the six—or seven—genuine Shakspeare signatures, what of the mass of other reputed spellings which Professor Lewis has agglomerated?

Again, Professor Lewis refers to "the Revels Accounts (1604-1605), which Chambers and others accept as genuine but which S. A. Tannenbaum (*Shakspeare Forgeries in the Revels Accounts*, 1928) holds to be definite forgeries by J. Payne Collier" (p. 7).

Can it be possible that Professor Lewis does not know of the work by Stamp, which appears to settle conclusively the genuineness of these documents?—which he does not include as documents. If they are genuine, they may be quoted as authority for a sixteenth-century spelling; if they are a forgery by Collier, only for a nineteenth-century spelling.

Thus the materials have been sorted, not too accurately, into certain purely mechanical classifications; but they have not been analyzed. Even the basic materials themselves are in important tested cases inaccurate and in others not even tested. It is hard to know on what grounds one could refer a reader to such a summary as this—unless for “more than one hundred” possible variant spellings of the name Shakspeare instead of a mere eighty-three in the next best list known to Professor Lewis.

As to the “correct” form of the name, which Professor Lewis prefers to spell Shakespeare, the fundamental question is solely of the standard of correctness to be accepted. If with Furnivall one takes the dramatist himself as best authority on his name, then in all six certainly genuine signatures, there is as certainly uniformity as far as “Shaksp”; in fact, as far as “Shakspe,” and no one doubts at least an *r* to follow. For the ending of the signature we have two “ere” against a possible one “eare”; even if this third signature be interpreted as “eare,” there is still the question of intent, since the wandering pen makes it clear that in some degree the original intent was not executed, however the final result be interpreted. As Professor Lewis almost sees, this spelling Shakspeare was also in fact the favorite one at Stratford for the family name.

The only other possible view is that Shakspeare—and those closest to the family—did not know how—or care—to spell the family name “correctly.” If we admit that the etymology is “shake-spear,” then, again, according to modern dictionary standards there can be no question that the “correct” way to spell the name now would be *Shakespeare*, as in the second issue of the Third Folio and in the Fourth Folio; and this was the favorite way of the eighteenth century, which established our dictionary standards of spelling. But London printers in Shakspeare’s day generally preferred to spell “speare,” as do the Latin-English and English-Latin dictionaries of the day, which set the educated standards. Consequently, printers of Shakspeare’s day tended to spell the name *Shakspeare*. The reviewer prefers Shakspeare himself as authority, but finds difficulty in persuading modern printers to be “incorrect.” Shakspeare and the family probably spelled the name according to local pronunciation and not according to etymology.

But in spite of all these drawbacks we now have at least legible facsimiles of many of the original documents assembled in one place. In the case of the drafts for a coat of arms, it can be seen from the assembled facsimiles that the various statements made in

them are generally consistent with each other and allege proper authority. One of these documents does not survive, and a note of its contents has not been clearly understood. When between November 17, 1599 and March 24, 1600 a draft was made for the impalement of the Arden arms on the Shakspeare arms, the official jotted some notes from another document at the end of the revised copy of the draft for grant of arms in 1596, so that the two documents might serve for his draft of 1599. Thus the date of these notes is about 1599.

To adapt the transcript of Professor Lewis, the official first wrote:

"This Joh[n] sheweth[?] A patierne therof vnder Clarent Cooks hand.

~ [in] paper

xx years past

A Justice of peace And was Baylif of Stratford vppo[n] Avon xv or xvj

years past

That he hathe Land[es] & tenem[en]t[es] of good wealth & Substance
500li. "

These notes appear in the draft for impalement to the effect that John "also produced a certeyne Auncient Cote of Arms heretofore Assigned to him whilst he was Iustice & Baylefe of that Towne." The drafting officer had first started to interline this into the preceding sentence but changed his mind and placed it as a continuation, his chief change being an insertion of the adjective "Auncient." Then he evidently referred to his original document again and emended his original note by writing words which Professor Lewis interpretes as "~~Towne~~ officer & cheffe of the Towne." This resulted in his striking out from the draft for impalement the word "Iustice" and inserting "her ma[ies]tes officer." These notes directly rather than the draft of impalement are also reflected in a reply apparently about March 1602 of Dethick and Camden to Brooke's accusations of irregularity. "And the man was / A magstrat in Stratford vpon Avon. A Justice of peace he maryed / A daughter and heyre of Ardern. and was of good substance and / habillite" (p. 345). The "heyre of Ardern" represents a further note below the others and outside their bracket, most of which note has perished, "That he mar." This allegation is found in the draft of 1596 and was carried over to 1599 and to the reply of 1602, but appears not to have been in the earlier "patierne."

Since the official has interpreted his own notes, we must take that interpretation as far as it goes. He says in 1599 that John "produced a certeyne Auncient Cote of Arms heretofore Assigned to him whilst he was Iustice & Baylefe of that Towne." So the official, on the authority of this document, accepts it as a fact that this "Auncient Cote of Arms" was assigned to John Shakspeare while he was high-bailiff; i. e., in the year from September, 1568. The notes of the official show that his authority was "A patierne therof vnder Clarent Cooks hand." Since Robert Cook had become Clarencieux in 1567, in whose province the Shaksperes were, Cook's

authority could and can well be taken for that statement. This is, of course, exactly what one would expect. It was in 1568-9 that John's dignity both demanded and permitted such an assignment.

Under the statement concerning the "patierne" is the annotation "[in] paper xx years past." This "patierne" is itself thus placed roundly about 1579. But when the official notes its allegation that John Shakspere was Bailiff, he adds that this was "xv o' xvj years past," evidently abstracting from the document and hence to be counted from its date. Thus the "patierne" was dated about 1583-5, this being roundly "xx years past" from 1599-1600. Cook acted as Garter 1584-6, and if the "patierne" had belonged to that period we should expect the reference to indicate it. So the "patierne" was most likely about 1583. It is the contents of this "patierne" that the official noted about 1599.

He bracketed the description of it and its two essential facts together. John Shakspere had a "patierne" of the coat of arms granted to him in 1568, and its two supporting facts were that he had occupied a position which entitled him to a coat of arms, and that he had sufficient wealth to support that dignity. These are evidently the reasons for the original assignment, and that assignment of arms was certainly valid, whatever might be true of the arms assigned. Since the grant of 1596 was being criticized, this "patierne" would establish the legality of the assignment of this coat of arms to John Shakspere, not to William the player. The attack would then have to be upon the arms assigned, and this appears to be what happened. There is nothing to indicate how the actual coat of arms assigned about 1568 was arrived at. Nor does it appear directly what was the purpose of the "patierne" of about 1583. It added to the grant of 1596 only these facts, and if there were others the official did not regard them as pertinent to the case in hand. He wanted the earliest assignment and its reasons, which was about 1568. He did not have the original document, but he had the "patierne" of about 1583. This superseded the document of about 1568 and was as valid as the grant of 1596, which is itself correctly referred to in a tricking among Segar's collection of arms under the name of "William Shackspere" as "A patherne p[er] Willm Dethike Garter principall k[ing] of Armes" (p. 216). Cook's "patierne" of about 1583 was as valid as Dethick's "patherne" of 1596, and was sufficient authority for the coat of arms from about 1568.

It is now clear that those who sniff at the Shakspere coat of arms will need to begin sniffing early. Whether or not it was a mere fiction and a delusion of grandeur, at least it was officially recognized as early as about 1568, and must have had considerable influence upon Shakspere's early outlook upon the social organization of life and his position in it. It was still flourishing about 1583, not far from the time when William Shakspere had been

married by license like a gentleman, even though many use the license as an argument that he had been "no gentleman." Now that the oldest son might expect an oldest son, evidently some action was taken.

So far the Shaksperes have been of Stratford and have dealt with the official immediately in charge of the Stratford district. But William had shifted his scene to London and proximity to the College of Arms. So the drafts of 1596 are from that source. The purpose of these is clear. John had been assigned a coat of arms about 1568 in his own right, and that right is still recognized as valid in 1599. But now in 1596 he claims the coat in the name of his "antecessors," who had received it under Henry VII. This is emended in the preliminary draft of 1596 as "parent[es] & late antecessors," this emendation being embodied in the draft. Then "Grandfather" is written above "antecessors" in the hand of the official of 1599. So in the draft of impalement in 1599 the official had first written "whose parent and Antecessor." He then emended by inserting "great Grandfather" for "parent" and "late" before "Antecessor." As a matter of fact, he may have written "great" before "Grandfather" in the draft of 1596, since that portion of the manuscript has perished. But this great-grandfather does remind us a little of Falstaff's opponents in the stages of his materialization, especially since he was necessary to make a "gentleman born" of John. So it is John's great-grandfather, not his grandfather, who is alleged to have received arms from Henry VII, and that great-grandfather materializes completely only in 1599, though he is implied in 1596.

Clearly, the purpose of these latter grants from 1596 was to make John—and William—"a gentleman born." The draft of 1599 embodies the allegations both of c. 1583 and of 1596, making those of 1596 even more specific and showing that the official regarded both the "patierne" of c. 1583 and the "patherne" of 1596 as valid; that is, John Shakspeare was recognized officially as a "gentleman born," and so would his son William be. So, no doubt, had William been taught to regard himself from infancy. What we do not know is whether the impalement of the Arden arms was granted, as desired in 1599. This would make of William officially a "gentleman born" on both sides of the family. Brooke or an assistant recognized "Shakespear y^e Player" and Segar or someone connected with him "William Shackspeare" as the true mover of the 1596 grant, and from 1583 he and his were the ones to benefit, not John directly. About 1583 William was no wild poaching youth, but a "gentleman born" with a coming family to advance, and eventually he provided handsomely for it, even though he may have had to begin, as one who knew the facts insists, as a schoolmaster in the country, and certainly did have to continue for a time as a player in London.

So while the work of Professor Lewis as a whole cannot be recom-

mended to the general reader, yet the cautious scholar can find, if he searches long enough, a core of useful materials in it—if he can persuade his Library to persuade a millionaire to present a copy. If Professor Lewis would present a revision along the lines suggested, at about one-third the price of the present, he could still produce a standard work of great usefulness.

University of Illinois

T. W. BALDWIN

The Second Part of Henry the Fourth. The New Variorum Shakespeare. Edited by MATTHIAS A. SHAABER. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1940. Pp. xx + 715. \$7.50.

Professor Shaaber's edition of *2 Henry IV*, the third of the New Variorum volumes to appear under the auspices of the Modern Language Association, is done with the same standards of thorough and competent workmanship as the other two. Unlike Professor Hemingway, who chose to reprint the first quarto of *1 Henry IV* because it was the only authentic text, Professor Shaaber, for reasons of convenience, reprints the folio text of his play, even though he thinks the quarto of superior authority. This raises the question of practice for the Variorum as a whole. There would be an advantage for students in having the texts chosen according to the same principle, whether it was authenticity, convenience, or the mere consistency, adopted by Dr. Furness with the edition of *Othello* in 1886, of following the First Folio. Consistency of editorial practice is also desirable in other matters which have in these three volumes been variously treated: the degree to which the text is edited (Shaaber and Hemingway reprint exactly, including errors; Rollins corrects literal errors); references to other plays (Hemingway and Shaaber refer to the Cambridge edition, not a convenient reference for most readers; Rollins refers to the Kittredge edition, itself numbered according to the Globe text); the numbering of lines in the text (Shaaber numbers every typographical line, including scene headings and stage directions; Hemingway numbers the lines of text only, the verse on a strictly metrical basis).

One of the most important features of Professor Shaaber's volume, along with the usual abundance of fare for users of the Variorum, is his own thoroughgoing study of the text. His theory, which he presents forcefully, yet without undue claims, and generally with recognition of the equivocal nature of much of the evidence, may be summarized: Q is suggestive of the author's MS. and not of a prompt-book. F is suggestive both of a prompt-book and of a literary MS. Its relation to Q is obscure; however, F was probably

not set from it, but from a transcript of a prompt-copy, itself a different MS. from that used as copy for Q. This theory is noteworthy in that it runs counter to the generally accepted theory, of Q and advances a more elaborate theory of F than has yet been put forward.

Professor Shaaber rightly follows Gaw, it seems to me, in denying that the presence of the actor Sincklo's name in V, iv of the quarto is an indubitable sign, as it is usually taken to be, of a prompter's hand; it may as well have originated with Shakespeare. The weakness of Professor Shaaber's argument that the copy for Q was not a prompt-book is inherent in the nature of such an argument; it can be based only on negative evidence and he does not always clearly make that admission. He fails to take account of the varying degrees of care with which different prompters annotated their play-books. The indefinite naming and numbering of characters ("soldiers," "others"), which he thinks would not survive in a prompt-book, are present, for example, in *The Two Noble Ladies* and *Believe as You List*, and persistent in *Thomas of Woodstock*, which has been through the hands of apparently five stage-revisers. I think we must agree, however, that even the negative evidence in Q (indeterminate specifications, mute characters, massed entries at the beginning of v, ii, absence of some necessary entrances) is sufficiently cumulative to throw considerable doubt on the prompt-book theory. In support of his argument that Q was set from Shakespeare's own MS., one wonders why he does not give prominence to the strongest evidence for autograph copy: that is, the evidence of possible revision *currente calamo* in the confused order of words and lines, omission, mislineation, and the like (see esp. I, iii, 83-5; IV, ii, 9). That he does see the implication of these disturbances is clear from his notes throughout the text on the passages in question. He is unsympathetic to Morgan's argument for elaborate revision of an earlier play.

Relative to the actual printing of the quarto, he furnishes a critical apparatus, but draws no conclusions. Beginning with sheet C, the quarto has been corrected throughout, and the seventeen extant copies exhibit a varying assortment of corrected and uncorrected formes. There appears to be a certain consistency of distribution that might have interesting implications if worked out.

As for the relations between the texts, both the theory that F was printed from a copy of Q corrected by a MS. and the theory that it was printed from the same MS. as Q rest on the presence of supposed common errors in the two texts. By quite convincingly showing that most of these are not errors, the present editor reduces the number to a small residuum, which he thinks may have survived from the common source of both texts. But it is difficult to see how such easily perceived errors as *hole* for *hold*, *appeare* for *appeard*, *imagine* for *imagind*, should survive through the three pro-

cesses of copying he posits for F. His own theory, that F is based on a transcript of a prompt-copy, is subtly argued. It is an attempt to reconcile two sets of conflicting indications, those that suggest a prompt-book, and those that definitely do not. He even goes so far as to suggest that the transcript may have been made by Ralph Crane, about whose working habits we have some knowledge. The weakness of his argument for literary revision is that he seems to regard as special features the sophistication of the text and the heavy punctuation, features which according to my somewhat random impression are characteristic of the First Folio generally. Chambers, who has the same impression (*Wm. Shakespeare*, I, 184, 190, 192, 198-9), suggests that these changes may have arisen in the printing-house itself, not in any general editing of the texts prior to publication. But the massed entries heading four scenes in the folio text of this play are a special feature that Professor Shaaber's theory seeks to explain. It merits careful study.

If his theory be accepted, it must have the following editorial implications: (1) since Q is based directly on Shakespeare's MS., the basis of a modern text should be Q; (2) since both Q and F are substantive texts (in McKerrow's sense), F should be followed wherever it supplies something lacking in Q or wherever Q is clearly wrong; (3) Q should be followed in the vulgarisms, colloquialisms, archaisms, and solecisms that have been sophisticated in F.

In the commentary accompanying the text, Professor Shaaber has made a valuable supplement to the opinions of commentators by a full use of the *NED*. This sometimes supplies authority for a reading rejected by editors, or it clarifies a meaning that was obscure. Sometimes, however, in using its authority to decide between divergent interpretations or to replace accepted interpretations, Professor Shaaber seems to me to insist unnecessarily on one meaning as the only correct meaning. As an example, for *dull* in "O thou dull God, why lyeest thou with the vilde" (III, i, 17) he rejects the causative sense "to make drowsy" because he says the *NED*. gives no authority for such a sense. But the authority of the *NED*. is based only on the observation of cases, and if the causative sense is clearly felt to be present in this passage, the absence of it from the *NED*. probably means only that this passage was missed. It is interesting that for sense *a. 5*, "Causing depression or ennui; . . . the reverse of exhilarating or enlivening," an allied meaning used causatively, the single illustration given is from Shakespeare (*Com. Err.* II, i, 91). Moreover, it is not necessary to decide among the senses "stupid" (*a. 1*), "drowsy" (*a. 3*), or "causing drowsiness" (analogy with *a. 5*), if all meanings fit the context, as they do, and contribute to its richness.

I have noted the following errors:

P. 472, list of variants, III, ii, 78 For "daye maintaine" read "daye, . . . maintaine"?

P. 497, line 9 A reference to I, III, 167-8, coming between I, III, 84-5 and II, I, 167-8, is evidently a "ghost" The scene ends at line 116

P. 503, fourth line from bottom For "of F Dyce" read "and F. Dyce"

P. 466 The description of the "Locker-Church" copy (B. & P 342, second issue, Qb) as containing a "rhomboidal mark" drawn in ink on sig B2r is incorrect. The mark is in what Professor Shaaber calls the "Church" copy (actually the "Halliwell-Tite-Locker-Church" copy, B & P. 329, first issue, Qa), the same copy containing Halliwell's note on the fly-leaf (which Shaaber only partially quotes) "It has also a special interest of its own in possessing a few short stage-directions in manuscript undoubtedly contemporary with Shakespeare, and in one place, sig B2, a plat as it is probable of the position of the characters on the ancient stage." The "plat" is the "rhomboidal mark"

MADELEINE DORAN

University of Wisconsin

Shakespeare and Democracy. By ALWIN THALER. Knoxville:

The University of Tennessee Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 312.
\$2.50.

The essay providing the title for Professor Thaler's volume, together with a supplementary essay on Whitman's attitude toward Shakespeare, comprises only a fifth of the total contents. Except for a brief epilogue "On Reading Old Poets," the remaining studies have appeared in various philological journals at intervals since 1920. Most are fairly recent, and some have been supplemented and revised. An introductory description of the plan of the miscellany suggests a unity and development scarcely perceptible in the actual work; yet the varied contents have in common that all deal with Shakespeare and succeeding playwrights and the theatre of their time.

One section brings together an interesting group of studies of country plays and strolling players, fragments of what might have been a full length treatment of the subject had time and opportunity been vouchsafed the author. The diaries and memoirs such as have provided Miss Rosenfeld the materials for her history of the strollers from 1660 to 1765 are lacking for the earlier period, but Professor Thaler's enthusiasm and ingenuity are such that a welcome volume would have resulted from his continued researches. As it is, we are glad to have in convenient form these earnestness of the "comprehensive and definitive book" he once hoped to write. Equal justification for the reprinting of the other studies can not always be found. They range in subject from the "lost scenes" of *Macbeth* and various "influences" involving the drama with the

writings of Spenser and Sir Thomas Browne, to notes on minor actors and minor questions of content in Shakespearean plays. The availability of this material in the journals would in some cases seem sufficient, especially since a portion of it has already gone into solution or even suffered rejection. In Bentley's *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (II, 389), Professor Thaler's case that Richard Brome was an actor is dismissed as "strained" but the case reappears unstrengthened in the present volume. On the other hand the essay "Shakespeare on Style, Imagination, and Poetry" certainly deserves collection. Arguing that the playwright was far from indifferent to the niceties of his art but alluded to them with constant delight, this study impresses the reader at once with the greater importance of its subject matter and the greater distinction of its style.

Professor Thaler's opening essay "Shakespeare and Democracy" is pleasant and sane but at the same time, it must be confessed, sketchy and disorganized. In familiar almost gossiping vein it weaves together allusion and anecdote, citing a host of works from *Comus* to *Mrs. Miniver*, from the *Works of Abraham Lincoln* to the *Knoxville News-Sentinel*. Omissions are as surprising as inclusions. Among the long list of spokesmen against Shakespeare one finds no mention of George Bernard Shaw or of Ernest Crosby, whose almost fanatical attack upon Shakespeare's attitude toward the working classes provoked Tolstoy's famous attack upon Shakespeare as an artist. Tolstoy himself is not mentioned. Nearly all the phases of the controversy over Shakespeare's political and social stand pass fleetingly before us in the (quite inadequate) forty-four pages of the essay, but none is treated fully, and the conflicting views are never brought into clear-cut apposition. Needless to say, Professor Thaler himself finds in Shakespeare nothing truly dangerous to the democratic cause. If the discussion comes to a focus at any point, it is in connection with the chronicle plays. these "refuse to gloss over the weaknesses, the wasteful exactions, the lawlessness, the tyranny of kings. Their author was no enemy of the commons, and he seems not to have been unaware of the dawning might of public opinion." The author is perfectly aware that this conclusion is not unfamiliar.

To the present reader the most interesting and valuable section of the book proves to be the second chapter, "Shakespeare and Walt Whitman," proffered as a kind of supplement to the chapter just discussed. Here Professor Thaler demonstrates, and is the first to do so adequately, that Whitman's arraignment of Shakespeare as belonging "essentially to the buried past" and as spokesman for ideals and institutions repudiated by all free peoples represented by no means his final or unqualified judgment. The series of extracts culled from Whitman's critical writings proves that, at least in one of his many moods, Whitman was convinced not only of

Shakespeare's supremacy as an artist but also of his spiritual timelessness, and of the fact that the poetry of democracy cannot cut away from its cultural heritage, least of all from Shakespeare. Finally comes an exposition of Whitman's recorded notion that the chronicles are Shakespeare's "most eminent" plays, that they display an "essentially controlling plan," and that this plan (carried out later even in the great tragedies *Macbeth* and *Lear*) was consciously to undermine through the effect of their "barbarous and tumultuous gloom" the political system which they portray. In a word Shakespeare became for Whitman not the spokesman of the old order but its covert enemy—the devoted *saboteur*. Professor Thaler does not, of course, accept this role for Shakespeare, nor will any other competent critic or historian. But the important point is that Whitman could do so, and thus by his own responses demonstrate that the great artist of the past, rendering "what was to him the truth," could not give sustenance to what was impermanent or evil.

ALFRED HARBAGE

University of Pennsylvania

The Passionate Pilgrim by William Shakespeare. The Third Edition, 1612. Reproduced in Facsimile from the Copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library. With an Introduction by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Folger Shakespeare Library Publications. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940. Pp. xli + 139.

The publications of the Folger Shakespeare Library are setting a high standard of bibliographical subtlety and learning. One could wish that the volumes were numbered, and that each contained a list of those previously published. Professor Hyder Rollins' edition of the 1612 text of *The Passionate Pilgrim* can be best studied in conjunction with its predecessor in the series, Dr. J. Q. Adams' extraordinarily successful treatment of the problems relating to the fragmentary text of the first (1599) edition of the same book. Professor Rollins also, in his *Variorum* edition of *Shakespeare's Poems* (1938), has handled many of the questions that his present introduction takes up, and in part in the same language. Any one who has mastered these three books will know a great deal more than has been known hitherto about William Jaggard's attempt to sell as Shakespeare's work certain wares which in fact had only a veneer of Shakespeare. Along with things more important, he will know that the number of pieces the piratical Jaggard purloined from Thomas Heywood's *Troia Britannica* to eke

out the third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* is not two, but nine (9),—or Mr. Rollins's reiterated prose will halt for 't. It seems, however, a trifle domineering to cast this arithmetical discrepancy so in the teeth of all the unfortunate commentators who, during a couple of centuries, were unable to see one of the two extant copies of the book that Mr. Rollins is now for the first time making available to readers not within the gates of the Bodleian or the Folger Library. Heywood himself was a worse bibliographer but sounder combatant, when he charged Jaggard with pilfering the two long and important poems, and let the small stuff pass. Personally, I would debit Jaggard with eight, not nine, thefts, for Mr. Rollins' poems nos. xxiii and xxiv, though ultimately derived from different parts of Ovid, are contiguous in Heywood; and the words introducing xxiv, "*And in another place somewhat resembling this,*" do not suggest a different poem, and are set in a smaller type than that used by Jaggard to head his various items.

The facsimile text is admirable. The cancel titlepage, which omitted Shakespeare's name, and four pages defective in the Folger copy are reproduced from the other exemplar in the Bodleian. The Introduction, if severe, is lucid, and explains one of the most irregular pieces of Jacobean book-making (technically and morally) with all the fidelity one expects from Hyder Rollins.

T. BROOKE

Yale University

The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays. By FREDERIC W. NESS.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 168.
\$3.00.

As its Introduction announces,

The present study proposes . . . a re-count of the couplets and other rhymes in Shakespeare's plays . . . a critical study of the rhymes with the view . . . of tracing the development of Shakespeare as an artist. Thirdly, it will examine contemporary drama and opinion to ascertain whether the fluctuations and gradual disappearance in Shakespeare are the result of an inner change or of some concession to current tastes. And, lastly, it will try to offer a more satisfactory explanation of Shakespeare's gradual abandonment of rhyme.

Dr. Ness has occasion to cite and sometimes to summarize the work of numerous scholars. For instance, he remarks (p. 10): "The best organized opposition to rhyme was the Areopagus, a group of scholars and poets who entertained themselves throughout much of the last quarter of the sixteenth century with certain reformations of English verse"; and he lists the probable members of this "group." In a footnote, he refers to Dr. Maynadier's well-

known article that in 1909 exploded the evidence for the existence of any such "organized" body; he admits that Maynadier maintains this position "with fair credibility," and yet in his text discusses this "organized . . . group": does he accept Maynadier, or does he not?

The present reviewer fares even worse; for Dr. Ness twice (pp. 10 and 106) describes an article of his that appeared in 1937 in the *Archiv* as maintaining "that the diminution of rhyme in the plays is the result of the artistic views of the new king," i. e. James I. As a matter of fact, the article in question declares that in this respect its data on rhyme seems "inconclusive." Dr. Ness's bibliography, moreover, is not quite above reproach: Zachrisson's standard work on Elizabethan vowels is omitted from the citations on pronunciation, and Gaw's paper on *A Comedy of Errors* is cited in the wrong volume of the *PMLA*.

In his text, Dr. Ness repeatedly (pp. 7, 20, 106) refers to Shakespeare's "gradual abandonment" of rhyme; and such a "gradual" process would strengthen his thesis that this change was entirely a matter of Shakespeare's inner evolution as an artist; but, unfortunately, his own computations, as set forth in Appendix B, show anything but a "gradual abandonment"; indeed, about half the plays written before 1603 have fewer rhymes than *The Tempest* or *Cymbeline*. Shakespeare used rhyme somewhat by fits and starts, distinctly more in certain earlier plays, distinctly less in certain later ones; but he does not *abandon* it, and its decline is certainly not *gradual*. The data in Appendix B rather suggest many and varied reasons for Shakespeare's use or disuse of rhyme; and so far as this evidence shows, one of these reasons might indeed have been the new King's known dislike of this poetic device: if Shakespeare chose the subject of *Macbeth* to please his royal patron, and added to Holmshed tactful praise of the royal ancestors, might he not likewise on occasion have calculated his poetic style to the meridian of the royal taste? A "satisfactory explanation of Shakespeare's gradual abandonment of rhyme" requires some consideration of such questions. Dr. Ness's volume has an interesting analysis of Shakespeare's uses of rhyme and of the purely artistic motives that doubtless more or less governed this aspect of his work; but Dr. Ness presses his thesis further than either logic or the evidence set forth allows.

JOHN W. DRAPER

West Virginia University

Man's Unconquerable Mind. Studies of English Writers, from Bede to A. E. Housman and W. P. Ker. By R. W. CHAMBERS. London: Jonathan Cape, 1939. Pp. 414.

The studies here presented are in the main revisions of anniversary addresses or of papers which had been published previously. Such collections not infrequently result from attempts to preserve matter of ephemeral interest and of no great significance. But this volume of studies cannot be so classed and lightly dismissed. The more familiar one becomes with the work of Professor Chambers, the more surely one realises that his treatment of any subject which he has considered worthy of presentation is worthy of serious consideration.

These studies range widely not only in time but in character—from closely reasoned argument for Shakespeare's participation in the authorship of the play of *Thomas More* or acute and detailed analysis of *Piers Plowman* and *Measure for Measure* through appreciations of Bede and More and Tyndale to personal recollections and impressions of his teachers and colleagues, such as Housman and Ker. One cannot expect any singleness of theme in papers and addresses which were composed on such a variety of subjects and published or delivered over a very considerable range of years. But there is at least the clear echo of a theme in almost all these studies; it is Chambers's belief in the significance of the individual in determining the development of the English people as opposed to the notion that the "spirit of the age" moulds and shapes the achievements of the individual. Chambers's admiration for true greatness of the individual human spirit shines through almost every paper.

Naturally, not all the studies are of equal weight. That on "Ruskin (and Others) on Byron" is so slight that it might well have been omitted, and those on "Bede" and on "*Beowulf*, and the 'Heroic Age' in England," though they are suggestive and very attractively done, are chiefly of value as showing how easily a scholar like Chambers can carry his wide and deep learning. The two final chapters on "Philologists at University College" are largely of local concern, but the twenty pages on A. E. Housman make a vital contribution toward appreciation of this scholar poet. The chapters on "*Piers Plowman*," on "Shakespeare and the Play of *More*," on the "Elizabethan and the Jacobean Shakespeare," and "*Measure for Measure*" deserve much fuller consideration than can be given here.

The two chapters on *Piers Plowman* constitute the longest unit in the volume. The primary purpose is to show unity of authorship between the A1 version and the A2 continuation, and between this entire A and the B version. The C version Chambers thinks came from the same author, though he considers it possible that the

author died before completing the C revision and that "some friend may have taken great liberties in issuing the C-text" (p. 167). This single author of *Piers Plowman* Chambers thinks was certainly called William Langland. The texts of A, B, and C as we have them in Skeat's edition "contain many verbal variants which are incompatible with unity of authorship," but these variants, Chambers is sure, can be traced to scribal corruptions (pp. 107-08). Every student of Middle English literature can only hope that the present desperate state of the world will not prevent Chambers from continuing his thirty years of labor on *Piers Plowman* until he provides a satisfactory text of all three versions.

The connection in theme that Chambers finds between the A1 versions and the A2 search for *Do-well, Do-better, and Do-best* (pp. 122-30) is too closely reasoned to be stated in a sentence or two. This connection is certainly plausible, but one can still doubt whether this connection proceeded from the same mind as that which presented the readily intelligible allegory of the preceding visions. The connection between the A version and the B version Chambers finds principally in the instances in which B clarifies or explains what is dark in the A version, the implication being that only a single man could thus explain himself. This implication is also plausible, but hardly inevitable. One may disagree with Chambers, too, upon a number of details. To this reviewer these indicate that the author of B did not have the same clear and effective control of his material as had the author of the A visions of Meed and of the Deadly Sins. But failure to be completely convinced does not carry with it failure to recognize the value of this study of *Piers Plowman*. It is much the most important examination of this great work that has been made within the last thirty years.

"Shakespeare and the Play of *More*" is a closely reasoned and effective argument that the "three pages" of the play were composed by Shakespeare and that they are preserved in his handwriting. Whether these two elements are necessarily united depends of course upon the validity of the assumption that the corrections in the manuscript of these three pages are such that they could not have been made by a copyist but must have been made by the author. The paleographical evidence that the handwriting is Shakespeare's has, as is well known, been strongly debated. To the paleographical evidence Chambers brings the support of several instances of the spelling "scilens" for "silence"—a spelling found only in these pages of *More* and in the quarto of *Henry IV, Part II*.

The evidence for Shakespearian composition, which is as convincing as can be made by the use of parallels, deserves very close attention as an example of investigative technique. The distinguishing character of this evidence is not the heaping up of isolated similarities in thought or in phrasing but the presentation of

striking similarities in combinations of thought, in linked groups of ideas, which occur in these pages and in plays undoubtedly Shakespeare's. These combinations are so individual, so characteristic, and so subtle that they must have come from one personality; the possibility of mere imitation seems excluded.

The chapters on the "Elizabethan and the Jacobean Shakespeare" and "*Measure for Measure*" are companion pieces. The former is a very shrewd attack upon the assumption still maintained by some notable British Shakespereans that since in the later years of Elizabeth Shakespeare wrote his merriest comedies and the earlier years of James his greatest tragedies and his "bitter" comedies, he was himself happy under Elizabeth and unhappy, disillusioned, cynical under James, and that these moods of Shakespeare reflected similar moods of England. Chambers shows how infirm are the bases for both these assumptions. It is very imprudent to dangle unwarranted assumptions or uncritical generalizations before the mind's eye of Chambers. In the study of *Measure for Measure*, Chambers makes a close analysis of the action and the characters to show that it is not a play of cynical disillusionment but one of repentance and Christian forgiveness. His analysis of the character of Isabel is especially penetrating and illuminating. A student of Shakespeare may possibly disagree with Chambers on some points of interpretation but he certainly cannot risk ignoring these chapters.

The entire collection of studies illustrates the range and depth of Chambers's scholarship, his critical keenness and saneness, and his own humane spirit.

W. F. BRYAN

Northwestern University

Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Edited by W. F. BRYAN and GERMAINE DEMPSTER. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago [1941]. Pp. xvi + 765. \$10.00.

Here is a worthy volume to stand beside the Manly text of the *Canterbury Tales*. Seldom has such an array of expert scholarship been brought to bear on a series of allied problems, and special credit must go to the general editors, who had all the difficulties that may be known to any compiler of a *Festschrift*. Most notable perhaps are the contributions that deal with the *Tale of Sir Thopas* (Mrs. Loomis) and the *Monk's Tale* (Mr. Root) because these involve a baffling complexity of study; but even while making this observation one hesitates because of the scrupulous thoroughness displayed elsewhere—as, for example, in the sections on the *Knight's Tale* (Mr. Pratt) and the *Clerk's Tale* (Mr. Severs). For finely spun ingenuity of inference and guesswork the section on the *Cook's*

Tale (Mr. Lyon) must long stand by itself as a *tour de force* in research. Throughout the volume the guiding hand and special assistance of Mrs. Dempster, Mr. Tatlock, Mr. Pratt, and certain others, appear from time to time in a way that must have made Mr. Bryan's task easier and the resulting production more finished. New material is everywhere: for example, in the study of Trivet (Miss Schlauch); in Carleton Brown's latest word on the *Prioress's Tale*, in the text of the *Livre Griseldis*; and in Mr. Gerould's remarks on the text of Mombricitus (*Second Nun's Tale*).

Despite the weight, which is a little too much for comfort, the book shows few traces of pedantry, although here and there general references to Robinson's notes might have saved space. In passing I note a few errors: the Pardoner does not say that "great sinners, especially adulterous women, must not make offerings to his relics" (p. 411). He is far cleverer than that; he says they cannot: "Swich folk shal have no power, ne no grace" (C. 383). And yet in this brilliant stroke lies an essential difference from the analogues quoted. The discussion of the portraits in the Prologue offers interesting comments but too much neglects the difference between the typical description, which may be found in the manuals of rhetoric (pointed out in Manly's Warton Lecture—cf. *Engl. Stud.*, LXVII [1932], 264), and the compact, realistic presentations in some of the treatises on vice and virtue and some of the allegories. Thus the following statement is not quite accurate: "Perhaps the only comparable grouping of personal descriptions in earlier medieval literature is found in the several versions of the story of Troy . . ." (p. 5). Some of the passages in the *Roman de la Rose* and in Gower's works might, as a matter of fact, be cited as analogues. As for omissions I note a few: the passage from Map's *De Nugis* describing ladies dancing on the green and disappearing might well be quoted under subsidiary material for the study of the *Wife of Bath's Tale*: cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, I (1935), 85 ff. The appearance of the Saint Cecilia story in the Breviary with details like some in the text of Mombricitus should be mentioned: cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, LV (1940), 357 ff. Finally I would quarrel with the policy of arranging all the material to follow the order of the Tales in Manly and Robinson. This has only a theoretical and rather academic value, which is nothing at all. But the book as a whole is a magnificent answer to the almost constant attack in the literary world on the study of sources. One may truly say that anything like a proper understanding of Chaucer's art is impossible without knowing something of the material that is here included. Over and over again in examining what is here made easily accessible to everybody who is interested, we come to the conclusions offered by the scholars themselves: Of one poem—"Genius is airily at play in *Thopas*, and the original combinations of old motifs, the unexpected grace of such lines as those describing the Fairy Queen, are not to be documented. They illustrate Chaucer's unimpeded origin-

ality in the very midst of closest imitation" (pp. 486-487). Of another—"The labor involved in investigating his sources is amply rewarded by the pleasure which comes from watching him at his work" (p. 466).

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. Volume IV, Imitations of Horace. With An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and the Epilogue to the Satires. Edited by JOHN BUTT. London: Methuen, 1939. Pp. liv + 406. 16/6. Volume II, *The Rape of the Lock and other Poems.* Edited by GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. London: Methuen, 1940. Pp. xx + 410. 16 sh.

It is high time we had a new edition of Pope; and if the four volumes of this edition that are yet to come maintain the standards set by these first two to appear, we shall have many grounds for gratitude. No better aids to understanding and enjoying the poems here presented can be found elsewhere in equal compass. The materials are effectively arranged and attractively printed. Arrangement of materials is most important where miscellaneous information of all types is so abundant. First we have a neat, clear recording of textual variants. Below these come generous and illuminating comments on individual lines. An introduction to each poem discusses its origin and general nature; longer notes on special topics form valuable appendices. Mr. Butt has followed Pope's habit of printing the imitated texts on the left page opposite the imitations. Certainly the fullest enjoyment of the imitations of Horace and Donne depends on comparison with the originals, which Mr. Butt's volume alone among modern editions facilitates. He has skilfully referred annotation of personalities in Pope's satires to a Biographical Appendix alphabetically arranged. There are bound to be limitations and imperfections in so extensive an appendix, but here they are not numerous or very annoying. Mr. Tillotson, in turn, is astonishingly at home among the biographical and "family" problems that encircle *The Rape of the Lock*, and his account of the genesis of that poem (II, 85-105) is easily the best ever written—though necessarily at points it rests upon hypothesis. Mr. Tillotson has high skill in illuminating a passage by apt quotation from other writers.

As annotation of Pope these volumes will stand comparison with any other edition. As text the same is true; but here one must enter certain reservations. The first is a small one about the record of collations. The preliminary notes on the texts carefully list editions from which variants are to be cited, and these editions are frequently numerous. Now granted that the drudgery of collation is enormous and at times unrewarding in an author so casually given to revision as Pope was, even so, in such an edition as this, one

expects an explicit statement that all editions available have been collated, and that in editions from which no textual variants are cited, none were found. A certain small amount of checking of the collations given indicates that the work of these editors is in general excellent; but in the case of the volume indicated as 1735d (Griffith 389) Mr. Butt seems frequently in error; for readings cited (pp. 40, 47, 60, etc.) as from this edition do not exist in it.

Another reservation as to texts printed concerns the editors' eclecticism in choosing to amalgamate various texts instead of consistently printing the "best" one and rigorously confining superior readings found in other editions to the footnotes—where their superiority can be signalized as glowingly as any editor may desire. Apart from spelling and punctuation Mr. Butt amalgamates verbal differences in at least two poems (iv, 266, 296), and Mr. Tillotson, who consistently blends the readings of one text with the spelling and punctuation of another, in a few cases blends verbal variants from two texts. The present reviewer regrets Mr. Tillotson's changing certain interrogations to exclamations (ii, ix), and suggests that this is precisely the sort of modification of an author's delicate meanings that no editor ought to permit himself to make. Throughout his poems as well as in his letters (as written, not as editors print them) Pope makes a highly individual and somewhat puzzling emotional use of the mark of interrogation: it is far from meaningless. (Some day some psychological critic may find the key to Pope's heart in his obsession in pointing strangely with the mark of interrogation?!!) Not much harm, thus far, is done by the Victorian eclecticism avowed by these editors; their texts are very good—but not quite definitive. Their texts are, conceivably, better than any Pope himself ever published, and it is against the principle of making such "improvements" that one protests. Furthermore, with five other editors yet to publish their work in this edition, one fears the vice of improvement may grow rather than diminish. But if the later editors do no worse than these two have done, the Twickenham Edition of Pope may well turn out to be the best we have.

GEORGE SHERBURN

Harvard University

The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England. By DONALD A. STAUFFER. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941. Two volumes. Pp. xiv + 572, viii + 293. \$8.50 (If sold separately \$5.00 each).

John Sterling: A Representative Victorian. By ANNE KIMBALL TUELL. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xiv + 405. \$3.50.

The first title reminds me of the amount of water that has gone

under the bridge since the publication of my *English Biography* in September, 1916. André Maurois was then unknown to fame. Emil Ludwig was an amateur with one novel to his credit. Gamaliel Bradford and Lytton Strachey were only at the threshold of their successes. My book appeared at a propitious moment. Three years later the first professorship of biography was established at Carleton College. Five years later the output of biography was rivaling that of fiction. Now it is one of the most popular forms of literature, and the end is not yet. One really enjoys having stood at the beginning of such a stir.

I ventured in 1916 to make a number of predictions. I said that some day there would appear adequate accounts of biography as art and as literature; of biography in its relation to history, fiction, psychology, and medicine; of the use of letters in biography. Most of these predictions have already come true or are on the way to fulfillment. I pointed out the need of an adequate American work comparable to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and now we have the admirable *Dictionary of American Biography*. I expressed a hope that we might have in English a version of Jerome Cardan's *De Vita Propria Liber*, a hope fulfilled in 1930 by the publication of Jean Stoner's translation of that vital autobiography. And so I might continue.

I say these things to encourage young scholars to continue work in this fascinating field with the same effectiveness and skill that Mr. Stauffer has demonstrated. His earlier *English Biography before 1700* is a thoroughly good and a very useful book. Now in his latest work he carries forward his studies, but in a markedly contrasting manner. The earlier book is carefully methodical, even formal, as if the author had been determined to keep his boundary lines sharp and clear. As he steps over into the eighteenth century, however, he apparently finds himself in a different world. The population per square mile is, as it were, immensely greater, and it is not easy to stake out the boundaries. The author has therefore very wisely, it seems to me, adopted a new plan. He devotes two complementary volumes to the century. In the first he discourses rather informally, chats in the best sense of that word, about biography as related to the drama, the novel, and the romantic spirit, about its wrestling with "knowledge infinite," and its revelation of "the life within." Then come two concluding chapters dealing in turn with "the great names" and "the trend of biography." The second volume is a bibliographical supplement containing a subject-and-author index of biographies and autobiographies and a list of the works of reference found most valuable in preparing the study.

I think Mr. Stauffer has proceeded wisely. Those who wish to do their own reading will need no better guide than this supplementary volume. Those who wish a personally conducted tour will enjoy the first volume. Even those self-reliant ones who prefer to

travel alone will find it greatly to their advantage to compare notes with the author. He knows how "to tear the heart out of a book," how to quote just enough to whet the appetite for more, how to suggest literary and historical connections, and he has a sufficient sense of humor. In short, he has opened the way for the general public to a valuable and interesting course of reading, and has provided for students a guide that will save them a great deal of time.

The second title is a Wellesley College Publication on the Sophie Hart Fund. Access to a large body of unpublished letters has enabled the author to enlarge considerably upon the work of all previous biographers of Sterling. The object has been to exhibit "the mind of John Sterling as characteristic of his time," to present him as "a representative Victorian," rather than to write a formal biography. We are given, beyond question, a large amount of useful and interesting material, a good part of it in Sterling's own words or in those of his previous biographers and critics. It should have been possible, however, within the compass of two hundred pages to give an adequate portrayal of Sterling as a representative Victorian. Such brevity the author has not attained.

For one thing the style is tiring, in places almost exasperating. Miss Tuell falls far too frequently into pseudo-Carlylese, into a bad habit of not expressing her thought simply. For example, when she writes "And to Sterling now and then Carlyle wrote out of the silences in the comfort of poetic intimacy, of his unuttered sorrows, of his more inward contemplations—things brave and grave and nobly memorable from the deeper quietudes," has she said anything more than "To Sterling, Carlyle frequently wrote his inmost thoughts"? She is wordy, tries to pack too much information into one sentence, and like Mistress Quickly is betrayed by the fact that any one thing suggests many others: "Of the Apostolic friends William Bodham Donne showed perhaps the finest promise, had not life supplied an endless line of children and an endless chance for unobtrusive self-sacrifice—a modest wit, a toast-master nonpareil, editor, essayist choicely good, country-gentleman, inspector of plays, pioneer librarian of the London library, voyaging through vast seas of cards alone." Again: "To such a man [as James Dunn] Sterling spoke eagerly of his hopes and speculations, his shortcomings, his ambitions, and his changes of mind during these brief years, turning with humility and beauty for help in a higher experience as if to a goodness poured out from above upon his tempestuousness." And again: "To Emerson and apparently to Emerson alone Sterling wrote freely on religion as man to man. Both religious and both exiles from the Christian communion though in deep sympathy with the Christian ideal, both were, also, we may add, deeply indebted to the philosophical statements of Coleridge though taken with reserve and adapted to personal use." A reader soon succumbs to a succession of such sentences.

I observe also a number of inaccuracies. In the fourth line on page 6 the date 1934 should be 1834. On page 54 James Dunn appears as Edward Dunn. Worst of all, Archbishop Trench's middle name is given at least ten times as *Chevenix* and is nowhere in the text printed correctly as *Chenevix*. In spite of all its limitations, however, the volume will help to keep alive the memory of a vivid and attractive man.

WALDO H. DUNN

Scripps College

Lucius Cary, Second Viscount Falkland. By KURT WEBER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 360. \$3.00.

This book is not to be read as an introduction to Lucius Cary, second Viscount Falkland, for Mr. Weber assumes that his readers will at least have in mind the story of Falkland's career. Those who are not thus informed would do well to read first the animated and perceptive story of Falkland told by Kenneth B. Murdock in *The Sun at Noon*, a book written at the same time as Mr. Weber's and published a year earlier. Mr. Murdock's "biographical sketch" of Lucius Cary, so described by him in order to indicate that it is not a "scholarly" study, is a well-rounded picture, and only the special student of early seventeenth century thought will be likely to feel the need of going further.

Mr. Weber's study reads as if it were meant to follow Mr. Murdock's, although they did most of their work in ignorance of each other's pursuits. Mr. Weber has endeavored to be "scholarly" and "exhaustive," epithets which Mr. Murdock rejects for his work. His researches have led him into the Tanfield family history, its interest centered of course in Cary's remarkable mother; into collections of seventeenth century manuscripts where he has found copies of verses by Falkland and by his mother; and, through the writings of Chillingworth, into the sources of Falkland's thought. The study stops short of Falkland's political career, for the author's subject is primarily Falkland as a host and friend to scholars and Falkland as a religious thinker. In addition to these two main concerns, he touches on Falkland as a poet and prints some of his verses in an appendix, agreeing with Miss Wallerstein in attributing to Falkland a fine skill in the management of heroic couplets. The composition of this book must have presented certain difficulties, for Mr. Weber's concerns differ fundamentally in kind: the chapters on Falkland's family life and the gatherings at Great Tew are historical and anecdotal, the chapters which have the posthumously published *Discourse of Infallibility* as a center are

speculative and analytical. Two distinct styles of writing are thus required and Mr. Weber shows himself to be at home in analysis but not in anecdote.

The method of revealing Falkland as host is to assemble the evidence of his contemporaries, with Clarendon's full description as a center. Mr. Weber rounds out Falkland's circle by describing each of his friends in turn. Often he allows his interest in their careers to lead him far from the central theme of their relation to Falkland. Not all of the men whom he describes had been guests at Tew; some were acquaintances rather than friends, but he faithfully provides the links in a wide circle on the assumption that it is better not to lose track of any contacts which Falkland had.

From this biographical roundup, Mr. Weber turns in his last two chapters to a study of William Chillingworth, his personality and beliefs, and to Falkland's exposition of the doctrines which he learned from Chillingworth. (For Falkland was a man who accepted teaching: in theology he followed William Chillingworth, as in politics he followed Edward Hyde.) These last two chapters are the most useful in the book and the material therein is well presented. In the effort to make interesting the story of Falkland's youth and the rosary of his associates, the author occasionally resorts to facetiousness in order to gain attention; in the analysis of Chillingworth's beliefs and their reflection in the fine but uncreative mind of Lucius Cary, he is himself so much at home and so interested that the writing and the reader become immediately much more at ease. Mr. Weber places Chillingworth and Falkland in the history of rationalism, showing them as inheritors of the spiritual humanism of Erasmus. He deals thoroughly with the charge propagated by Aubrey that Falkland was "the first Socinian in England," and demonstrates the fact that this would have been a shocking thought to Falkland. *In necessariis unitas; in dubiis libertas; in omnibus caritas*, he takes as Falkland's motto, and it is Falkland's tragedy that, believing as he did so deeply in the need for a national religious unity, he had to play out the short role of his life in times that were torn by a frenzy which he, as a rational gentleman, was incapable of understanding, let alone pacifying.

PHYLLIS BROOKS BARTLETT

Russell Sage College

Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale). By JAMES L. CLIFFORD. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1941. Pp. xx + 492. \$6.50.

The effervescent lady who brought the successive surnames of Thrale and Piozzi into literary history was not fated to find a real

biographer before the lapse of a century, "the term," in her friend Johnson's phrase, "commonly fixed as the test of literary merit." She has found one now, and his work is a handsome atonement for all that she has suffered from some of her earlier interpreters, whose faults of amateurishness, incompleteness, and over-chattiness are often disconcertingly like her own.

Mr. Clifford's book is all that a standard literary biography should be. His indefatigable research, thorough scholarship, and admirable sense of proportion are evident throughout a long volume which is neither thin nor padded. Its professional finish, its scrupulous documentation, and its prevailingly objective narrative method form a contrast indeed to the chaos of Hayward and the patronizing airs of Vulliamy. Its author's admiration for the subject of his book would have qualified him as champion in a spirited defense of her conduct and motives, but there is less need today than there once was for entering those lists. He concerns himself chiefly with presenting the factual evidence from which a fair-minded reader can draw his own estimate of Mrs. Piozzi's personality and intellect. From no other single work can the reader do it so well. When the volatile and voluble creature has been put through the apparatus of scholarly biography, she emerges with her charm and piquancy unimpaired and with the underlying strength of her character more clearly demonstrated than ever before. In a sacrificially brief epilogue Mr. Clifford confesses that there are still contradictions, surprises, and hidden reserves to baffle those who must have neat, complete, and consistent "characters" fastened upon their literary acquaintances. But his full and careful analysis of the documentary record does more than any amount of so-called appreciation or interpretation to redress the harm done to Hester Thrale's reputation by Boswell, Fanny Burney, and Macaulay, to mention only her superiors in talent.

The style of the book is clear, vigorous, and blessedly free from learned affectation and pedantic "wit." The biographer is always in control of the heavy mass of material: one wishes he could have instructed the compiler of *Retrospection* and *British Synonymy* herself. He handles the problem of quotation with great judgment, eschewing the long extracts to which the diffuseness of Mrs. Piozzi's syntax must often have tempted him, and summarizing expertly many important but familiar letters or passages. In general her letters tend to keep a level and do not naturally divide themselves into high spots and low. Such a high spot as her masterly reply to Johnson's hasty letter on her marriage might well have been pointed up more than it is, but readers who know many of the letters or journals at length will usually approve Mr. Clifford's taste. Unlike Mrs. Piozzi, he quotes with textual accuracy.

The entire book combines breadth of view and close attention to minutiae. Mr. Clifford can delineate strongly but unsentimentally the emotional stresses which assailed the mother of Henry Thrale's

children and yet pause to ascertain and record the capacity of two of her teapots. His account of her often underrated maternal feelings is much indebted to the unpublished journal or "Children's Book" of 1766-78. The other unpublished material which increases the importance of his work is fully recorded in introduction and appendixes, and it can be seen at a glance that he has had good hunting. Although permitted to study *Thraliana*, he has generously used parallel sources where possible out of consideration for Miss Balderston's momentarily expected edition. As the introduction reminds us, A. M. Broadley predicted in 1909 that the dispersion of manuscripts would probably "prove an insurmountable barrier to the completion of an exhaustive work dealing with the life and correspondence" of Mrs. Piozzi. Mr. Clifford has nobly cleared the barrier.

Only in the index, that trap for a fatigued author, does any lowering of the standards of fullness and accuracy appear. A large index is required, and minor omissions can be forgiven. But there seems to be little consistency in the treatment of proper names in the footnotes: most of the references to modern scholars and writers, for example, are unindexed, although a few have found places. There is similar inconsistency in the handling of the names of owners of manuscripts. Inclusion of the titles of newspapers and magazines referred to would have been useful.

Mr. Clifford's biography is worthy to stand with the best of the recent work on the Johnsonian circle. It shows that although Jove's satellites are less than Jove their lives and writings can stimulate and reward scholarly effort of a high order.

RICHARD L. GREENE

The University of Rochester

The Language of Satirized Characters in Poëstaster. By ARTHUR H. KING. Lund Studies in English, x, 1941. Pp. xxxiv + 258. 10 Kronor.

The general aim of this work is somewhat cryptically revealed in its subtitle, "a socio-stylistic analysis 1597-1602." By "social stylistics" King means the analysis of language according to the social stratum occupied, or aspired to, by the speaker. A minor flaw is the implication that this is something so new in the philological world that it requires a special name and special method. The more restricted aim is "to refine our ear for class- and group-tones in the language of a work, an author, a period."

King's method of achieving these aims consists of subjecting the language of Jonson's *Poëstaster* (1601) to an unusually close scrutiny with the aim of determining what language Jonson satirized

and why. The material from *Poetaster* is carefully compared with other dramatic material from the period 1597-1602, supplemented by the evidence of the *NED*. and other works, chiefly lexical.

It is, of course, at once apparent that this material is inadequate to achieve the general aim spoken of above, for a comprehensive "socio-stylistic analysis" demands a consideration of material drawn from other sources. A good beginning, however, has been made, and the more specific aim of refining our ear for class tones as well as other lexical and stylistic nuances in the drama of Jonson and his contemporaries is fully achieved. And in doing so, King has produced a work which is of considerable importance for students of Jonson, of Elizabethan literature, of prose style, and of lexicography.

For the excellence of the work credit is due both Jonson and King. Jonson's theory of and practice in language provide a touchstone for determining in general what is "good" late Elizabethan English, i. e. by Jonsonian standards. Furthermore, Jonson's language satire in *Poetaster* indicates specifically various types of "bad" or affected speech. But to detect this satire at its subtlest, the nuances or overtones conveyed by language affectation, requires a close reading of context plus a careful comparison of this suspected affectation in other works of Jonson and his contemporaries. This laborious task King has performed with discrimination and care. (This care, however, is not extended to the list of texts, in which I note several omissions.)

What seems to me to be the major flaw of the work is due to King's emphasis upon his "socio stylistic" thesis. As a thesis this is both too broad (see above) and too narrow, for there is much of value in the work which is not primarily, if at all, concerned with language fashions of various social strata. Furthermore, this thesis has inevitably led to an organization which is both logically unsound and confusing to the reader. The following brief chapter summaries, included primarily to indicate the scope and value of the work, will, I believe substantiate this criticism.

Chapter I consists of an analysis of Crispinus's affected diction with the primary view of determining whom or what Jonson was thus satirizing in this part of the "Stage Quarrel." Of the 165 Crispinian expressions, most are pedantic or courtly affectations, but there is also a considerable number of crude, vulgar, colloquial, and slang terms. Since only 84 of these Crispinian expressions are found in Marston's work (and of these 84, only 15 are not to be found in the works of other contemporaries), King concludes that the satire is directed at a broader target than Marston alone. Particularly aimed at Marston is the crude diction Crispinus uses in his verse.

Chapter II is concerned with the language affectations of the clique associated with Julia. From the point of view of dramatic

structure—and even from the socio-stylistic point of view—this grouping of the language of such socially and linguistically heterogeneous characters may be justified. Nevertheless in spite of King's efforts to avoid it, the result is somewhat confusing, for Crispinus is again included, Ovid is a-typical, and such characters as Chloe and Albius represent a distinctly lower social stratum than do the others.

Chapter III, like Chapter I, is concerned chiefly with the language of a single character, Tucca. It sheds some interesting light upon his character; his affinities with other Elizabethan characters, like Bobadilla, Eyre, Pistol, Falstaff, who speak an exaggerated street language; and the differences between Tucca of *Poetaster* and *Satiro-mastix*. With King's conclusion that Campbell (*Huntington Lib. Bull.*, 9) is wrong in seeing Ovid, rather than Tucca, as the center of the play I cannot agree.

Chapter IV deals with the linguistic affectations not of particular persons or groups, but of those common to several. Accordingly it furnishes interesting evidence—as does the work as a whole—of the spread of affectation from upper to lower classes, e. g. from court (Julia) to middle class (Albius) to street (Tucca). It also—and this is true of the Introduction too—contains some good material on the changing prose style of the period.

Thus, even in so brief a summary, it is apparent that the primary purpose and value of Chapters I and III are not concerned with socio-stylistic analysis but with problems of literary history and criticism. The value of the work as a whole is lexical in that it provides much that is supplementary to the *NED*. and other more specialized glossaries. In using it for this lexical information readers will find it time saving to consult the word-index directly, without referring to the various introductory and concluding discussions, however interesting and valuable these may be for other purposes.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of Florida

The 'Split Infinitive' and A System of Clauses. By OTTO JESPERSEN. S. P. E. Tract No. LIV, 1940. 19 pp. *The Growth of American English.* By WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. S. P. E. Tracts No. LVI and LVII, 1940. 66 pp.

Professor Jespersen's brief discussion of the split infinitive contains several interesting and thoroughly sound observations about the history and syntax of this construction and its employment to avoid ambiguity. However, after pointing out that the *to* "is no more a part of the infinitive than the definite or indefinite article is

part of a noun" (and hence the term "split infinitive" is something of a misnomer), Jespersen curiously concentrates upon the *to* rather than the infinitive proper. Thus in commenting upon the possible reasons for the development and growing popularity of the construction, he says, "I think one of the chief reasons [for splitting] is the fact that *to* is often felt to belong to the preceding verb rather than to the infinitive. . . ." In some instances this is true, but usually, it seems to me, it is not so much a feeling of where the *to* belongs as where the adverb belongs. When the split infinitive is the subject—a not infrequent phenomenon—and in other uses as well the *to* clearly cannot belong to the preceding verb.

This same concern for the *to* rather than the infinitive proper leads to an overemphasis of the value of the split infinitive in promoting clarity. Jespersen lists a number of sentences which "have gained by the adverb being placed after *to*." One example is the sentence pair: *He prepared silently to accompany them. He prepared to silently accompany them.* Here the same gain would be achieved if the *silently* were placed after the *them*, i. e. without reference to the *to*.

In his second short paper Jespersen's main concern is with proposing a new system for classifying adverbial clauses or, as he calls them, clause tertiaries. The "orthodox" classification of clause tertiaries has two bases, grammatical and notional, and such classification is sometimes inadequate to indicate accurately the relationship of the events expressed in the main and dependent clauses. In the sentence *While the grass grows the horse starves*, the two events are (or may be) independent, yet the first clause would ordinarily be called a dependent (grammatical) clause of time or contrast (notional). The difference of opinion about the latter depends largely upon the degree of notional significance attached to the conjunction.

Jespersen actually retains both of these classifications, but he subordinates them to a third. This classification is based upon the logical relationship of the events expressed in the main and subordinate clauses. This relationship may be one of: 1. mutual independence, 2. comparison, 3. contrast, 4. dependence of the one upon the other.

For sentences like the one cited above, and for many others containing adverbial clauses, Jespersen's classification undoubtedly provides a more satisfactory means of analysis than does the orthodox classification. Furthermore it is an excellent device for recognizing or demonstrating the discrepancy between grammatical and logical relationships. The main defect, it seems to me, is the fact (which Jespersen recognizes but does nothing about) that as a system it is not logically applicable to clause tertiaries alone, for it applies as well to other types of clauses, sentences, and even larger units of expression.

Using material only from the A and B parts of the *Dictionary of American English*, Sir William Craigie discusses "the extent to which the language has been enriched without the adoption of extraneous elements and . . . the various causes and conditions which have contributed to this." Omitted from consideration are American loan-words, as well as the slang and dialect terms not recorded in the Dictionary. The remaining Americanisms fall under four main heads: 1. terms which have developed new meanings, 2. new derivatives, collocations and compounds, 3. new words developed from the normal sources of English or which are bold innovations, 4. survivals of old terms.

Since the substance of the essay consists largely of material available in the Dictionary, Sir William contributes little if anything that is new. Nevertheless it is an interesting and informative essay, for it provides a fuller statement about certain aspects of the purpose and plan of the Dictionary than is contained in the Preface, and demonstrates the value that this work has for all varieties of students of American civilization.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of Florida

Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers. By ELIJAH HARRY CRISWELL. University of Missouri Studies, Vol. xv, no. 2, 1940. Pp. cxxi + 102.

This volume "attempts to present the results of an examination of the vocabularies found in the extensive journals kept by the members of the momentous Lewis and Clark Expedition of 1804-1806." From the total vocabulary Dr. Criswell has selected all of those terms which may loosely and somewhat inaccurately be called Americanisms. These 1859 terms are arranged alphabetically in the lexicon proper. Each entry is provided with one or more quotations, a succinct statement of its treatment in other dictionaries, and a letter designating in which of five categories it belongs. These categories are: A. Americanisms (acknowledged and disputed), B. New Words (terms hitherto unrecorded or recorded later than the *Journals*), C. Old Words (marked obsolete or archaic in the *NED.*), D. Words filling gaps of a hundred years or more in the *NED.*, and E. Miscellaneous (words showing peculiarities of form, spelling, inflection, etc.). Obviously, and as Criswell points out, these categories are not mutually exclusive: Some terms in E are also listed under another head; most of the terms in B are undoubtedly Americanisms, etc. Nor is the claim made that all terms under B, C, D, E are Americanisms, even though most of them undoubtedly are.

The value of the work is due to two quite independent factors. In the first place, because of the time and place of the Expedition, because of the intelligence of its leaders, and because of the instructions given them by President Jefferson, the journals are a rich mine for the student of Americanisms. In the second place, Criswell has performed his task of selecting terms and of checking them against other lexicographical works with unusual accuracy. The result therefore is a work which (1) gives us a certain amount of information about the language problems of the pioneer faced with the necessity of giving names to new things; (2) pending the completion of the *DAE*, provides a tentative list of the words Lewis and Clark added to the language; (3) furnishes some information supplementing that of the *DAE*, unfinished or finished.

Unfortunately, these results, while not inconsiderable, are hardly commensurate with the amount of work expended. Most of the information presented in the lexicon proper will eventually be contained in the *DAE*, where it will of course be properly treated in broader perspective. In this respect Criswell's study differs from Ramsay and Emberson's *Mark Twain Lexicon*, with which it invites comparison, for it is obviously modeled after the Mark Twain study. The value of the latter will not be greatly diminished by the completion of the *DAE*, for it is a study not only of Americanisms but of Mark Twainisms. In its latter capacity it has an independent value, since the vocabulary of Mark Twain is of interest by itself. This of course is by no means as true of the vocabulary of Lewis and Clark.

In addition to the Lexicon, consisting of 93 pages, Criswell has written 209 pages of introductory material, most of which might well be omitted, and all of which would be decidedly improved by condensation, for there is much that is repetitious and much that elaborates the obvious.

A few details call for comment. The discussion (p. cci, f.) of the D class (words filling gaps) hardly does justice to the *NED.*, for Criswell fails to point out that it was the plan of the *NED.* to give "about one quotation for each century." Furthermore, if slight variants are considered, the gaps in the *NED.* are not usually as serious as Criswell's dates seem to imply. I am inclined to think that most of the terms under B¹ might be omitted as mere nonce-terms. The title of the *Linguistic Atlas of the U. S. and Canada* is not accurately given (p. vii). *Dialectical* (p. cxvii) is not a good term for *dialectal*. The discussion (p. ccv, ff.) of spelling, phonological, and grammatical peculiarities is weak: In commenting on *parih* for *path*, etc. attention might be called to the fact that Lewis and Clark were from Virginia (though to be sure this is stated elsewhere). *Holler* and *ideer* are not necessarily inverse spellings. Many terms, like *Ar-Sar-ta* for *ahsah-ta*, *orning* for *awning*, *Srimp* for *shrimp*, are not included in the discussion,

and while limitation of space might be pleaded as a reasonable excuse for this, I see no reason why they might not have been designated with the letter E in the lexicon. It is not strictly accurate to say "The presence of intrusive consonants is revealed in . . . *clift* for *cliff*." *Brand* for *bran* may be an inverse spelling. *Rifle* (p. clx) is still widely used as a synonym for *ripple* in the sense of a slight fretting of the water. A serious annoyance is caused by the fact that the lexicon entries contain no page reference to the pertinent discussion in the introduction.

To these detailed criticisms a few others might be added, but the total number—considering the size and nature of the work—would be very small. This fact should indicate that the study, though very limited in scope and value, is a conscientious, accurate piece of work.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of Florida

Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the Encyclopédie.

By JOSEPH EDMUND BARKER. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941. Pp. 143.

This is, on at least two counts, a decidedly "tough" subject. On the one hand, the many-sided Diderot and the bulky *Encyclopédie* are certainly both very difficult to master. On the other, the theological nature of the material in question, much of it so remote from prevailing currents of modern thought, forces the lay student to become familiar with many kinds of abstruse and erudite sources. Mr. Barker has attacked his problems in calm, business-like fashion, without fanfare. He discusses the issues objectively.

Recently M. Salesse, after examining some *thirty* of Diderot's religious articles, concluded in favor of his extraordinary theological competence. Mr. Barker has studied nearly *three hundred* articles (p. 10). Many of these articles he has been able to trace to their complex sources in Chambers, in Dom Calmet, in the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, in Brucker, Deslandes, Bayle, and others (pp. 14-26). After this intensive study, Mr. Barker finds that Diderot's work in the *Encyclopédie* is often conventional, orthodox, and prudent, transcribed in hasty, journalistic fashion from borrowed sources. This is no matter for surprise. The censor was at his elbow, so to speak, the amount of work to be done by one man was overpowering, the necessity for haste was great. In spite of flashes of originality and boldness, Diderot's interest "in the philosophy of religion," Mr. Barker finds, was not as great as M. Salesse is inclined to believe (p. 25).

It should not be forgotten, however, observes Mr. Barker, that the orthodox articles were necessary in an encyclopedic work in order to give information about an important field of knowledge (p. 12).

They served too as a contrasting basis for the more or less surreptitious attacks made in the unorthodox articles (pp. 12, 129).

For myself, I should be inclined to stress somewhat the importance of the "unimportant" articles. In many articles, seemingly of mere definition, sentences which serve as examples of word-usage are chosen also for their ironic or subversive content. This is very characteristic of the encyclopedic technique. Or an apparently innocent article like that entitled *Aigle*, for example, may conclude ironically and unexpectedly:

Heureux cent fois le peuple à qui la religion ne propose à croire que des choses vraies, sublimes et saintes, et à n'imiter que des actions vertueuses! telle est la nôtre où le philosophe n'a qu'à suivre sa raison pour arriver au pied de nos autels (Assézat, XIII, 266).

The reader can never be sure where a covert thrust will turn up. Thus, there is a greater leaven of attack upon conventional beliefs than might appear by a mere tabulation of the number of orthodox versus unorthodox articles *devoted to church subjects*.

It will be remembered that Diderot in a letter of November 12, 1764, charged his publisher, Le Breton, with grossly mutilating many articles. Now, it appears, Diderot's original proof sheets, "bound in the supplementary volume of a privately-owned first edition" (p. 10) of the *Encyclopédie*, are in this country. Mr. Barker has been permitted to scan them briefly in a microfilm copy. His tentative conclusion is that there is no evidence of serious "mutilation." The changes appear to have been "changes of language rather than substance" (*ibid.*). Yet Diderot cried to High Heaven about the matter. "On fera passer le livre pour une plate et misérable rapsodie," he wrote. People will say that

cette volumineuse compilation . . . n'est qu'un ramas d'insipides rognures. . . . En effet, a-t-on jamais oui parler de dix volumes in-folio clandestinement mutilés, tronqués, hachés, déshonorés par un imprimeur? . . . J'en ai perdu le boire, le manger et le sommeil. . . . Voilà donc ce qui résulte de vingt-cinq ans de travaux, de peines, de dépenses, de dangers, de mortifications de toute espèce! (Assézat, XIX, 468, 469, 470.)

Shall we conclude that the mercurial Diderot exaggerated, for some reason or for no reason? Was he perhaps building up an alibi to forestall criticism from his philosophic friends who felt that many of the articles were too weak and prudent? Not until these proof sheets have been thoroughly studied by their present owner and his collaborator can these important questions be definitely answered.

Meanwhile, Mr. Barker's sane, convincing, and calm conclusions throw much light upon Diderot's encyclopedic articles dealing with Christianity. Most important for the close student of Diderot's thought is the careful tabulation of sources. We can now to a great degree gauge Diderot's indebtedness to previous compilations and estimate the extent of his originality.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

The Ohio State University

Bibliography of Italian Linguistics. By ROBERT A. HALL, JR.

Published by the Linguistic Society of America at the Waverly Press, Inc., Baltimore, 1941. Pp. 543.

With this book Mr. Hall has answered a long-felt want among serious students of everything pertaining to the linguistic history of Italy. Nothing of real importance seems to have escaped his garnering hand, and he has sifted his material well. The four major divisions of the volume: Part I, History of the Italian Language, pp. 30-199; Part 2, Description of the Italian Language, pp. 200-218; Part 3, Italian Dialectology, pp. 219-424; Part 4, History of Italian Linguistics, pp. 425-437; are suitably flanked by a brief, but pertinent, Introduction and List of Abbreviations, a few pages of Addenda, and five complete and welcome Indices.

It would be easy, but unfair, in reviewing a work of such a detailed nature as Mr. Hall's, to point out as serious defects certain omissions, typographical errors, debatable classifications, and such other *minutiae*. Thus, one might doubt the wisdom of excluding the bibliography of the Sardinian and Friulan dialects in order to avoid listing them as Italian dialects. The practical value of the volume would have been enhanced by their inclusion, and the author could have justified his action by stating that Romance scholars are not in complete agreement concerning their classification. It is unfortunate that M. A. Per's recent book *The Italian Language*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, was not published in time to be included in the *Addenda*, at least,—of which there are four pages. Also, I note errors in the spelling of Rumanian words under the following titles: 483, *noas*, *voas* should be *noao*, *voao*; (3248), *di* and *romina* should be *de* and *romină*; (3860) *Evolutia*, *actuala* and *linvisticii* should be *Evoluția*, *actuală* and *linguisticii*. An eagle-eyed critic might discover a few other unimportant slips on the part of the printer. Since an excellent feature of Mr. Hall's *Bibliography* is his personal notes on important studies, I am sure uninformed scholars would have welcomed some reference under title 3438 to the archaic characteristics of certain South Lucanian dialects, where, as in Sardinian, Classical Latin *i* and *ū* evidently did not have the same development as *ē* and *ō* in Vulgar Latin, and final *-s* and *-t* are preserved in the verb system. From among the grammars of Neapolitan I miss the two editions of the work by the versatile Abbate Ferdinando Galiani: *Del Dialetto Napoletano*, edizione seconda corretta e accresciuta, Napoli, Presso Giuseppe Maria Porcelli, 1789. (Collezione di tutti i poemi in lingua napoletana, tomo 28), and *Del Dialetto Napoletano*, con introduzione e note di Fausto Nicolini, Napoli, Riccardo Ricciardi editore, 1923 (Biblioteca napoletana di storia letteraria ed arte, VI). An important inadvertent omission is *A Bibliographical Guide to the Romance Languages and Literatures*, compiled by Thomas R. Palfrey, Joseph G. Fucilla and William C. Holbrook, Northwestern

University, Second edition, Chandler's Inc., Evanston, Illinois, 1940.

However, if we consider the purpose of the book,—as stated satisfactorily in the Introduction,—which is “the listing, in the shape of a formal bibliography, of all material dealing with the scientific study of the history and description of the Italian language and dialects, and with the Romance languages in general insofar as Italian and its dialects are involved,” we cannot praise Mr. Hall too highly for having made available to Romance scholars an exceedingly useful and stimulating tool for the intelligent study of Italian linguistics. It will encourage further research by permitting budding aspirants to seats among the specialists to appraise in a short time the work done on any particular problem. It should prove a mine for graduate students seeking subjects for doctoral dissertations. Two outstanding merits of the *Bibliography* are the listing of reviews of important works with an indication of the reviewers' verdicts, and the chronological arrangement of the items in the separate sections. All in all, the book is sufficient, scholarly and promising.

LOUIS F. SOLANO

Harvard University

Truth of Two and Other Poems. By PEDRO SALINAS. Translations of ELEANOR L. TURNBULL. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. ix + 289.

Four years ago the Johns Hopkins Press published *Lost Angel and Other Poems*, a volume of translations by Miss Turnbull of Pedro Salinas' earlier works: *Presagios* (1923); *Seguro Azar* (1929); and *Fábula y Signo* (1931). In the present volume the same translator offers to the English speaking reader a worthy sequel containing samples of the poet's most tenuous and subtle manner as manifested in the love sequence, *La Voz a Ti Debida* (1933), and in the most mature of his books, *Razón de Amor* (1936), a composition whose name, at least, reminds us of that “*odra rason acabada / feyta d'amor e bien rymada*” by an anonymous poet of the XIII century. All the poems in the last mentioned books are united by a common theme, love, and they show the poet's affinity not only with Bécquer, but also with Garcilaso.

As in the first volume the Spanish version is on the left page, the English on the right, and the poems are translated line for line into English verse of singular fidelity and accuracy. But as the poetic images in these originals are often so ethereal, and the poet has become less and less external, and more and more *intimista*, Miss Turnbull's rendering may seem to firm up many a line, intensify vague contours, and even bring out to light what was created

within the recondite arcades of the poet's mind. For Salinas is often untranslatable and one must reread him several times, "collaborate" with him in order to be rewarded. His profound lyricism touched by an intellectual sentiment is expressed so cryptically that the translator has found necessary, for the sake of the English reader, to round out sharp corners and to bridge gaps with connectives, achieving thereby considerable lucidity. The effect is ever poetic, nonetheless, as one can judge by comparing a few difficult lines:

Y súbita de pronto,
porque sí, la alegría.

pura virgen vertical

¡Regalo, don, entrega!

Simbolo puro, signo.

Se sonríe, posible

¡Qué gran vispera el mundo!

No había nada hecho.

And suddenly came joy,
unforeseen, unfortold.

a guileless, upright maiden

My homage, gifts, devotion
what are they but symbols, signs.

It smiles of the possible

It seemed that we were living
on the eve of the world.

Throughout the book one gets glimpses of the translator's poetic understanding, an understanding which amounts to collaboration with the poet—re-creation. The reviewer ventures to hope that the Johns Hopkins Press may continue to publish similar translations in order to acquaint the English speaking reader with the new poetry of Spain and Spanish America.

CARLOS CASTILLO

University of Chicago

Hawthorne as Editor. Edited by ARLIN TURNER. University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 290. \$2.75. (Louisiana State University Studies, 42.)

Out of much recent activity in making available the complete Hawthorne material come these editorial contributions to the *American Magazine of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge*. Designation of Hawthorne as editor is, of course, somewhat misleading in these days when we do not associate commentaries and résumés with editorial duties. But even so, the capacious mind finds wisdom in strange places, and Hawthorne, freeing himself from journeyman tasks, sometimes showed his mature, critical manner, in a dramatic sketch of John Adams and Revolutionary Boston, in a travel account of Martha's Vineyard, or in such essays as *Marriage and Long Life*, *Hats*, *April Fools*, *Caverns*, and *Wharves*.

Turner's introduction adequately analyses the contents from the point of view of classification and of originality, explains the arrangement of the material as topical, and traces Hawthorne's hur-

ried toil and waning interest. An article in the 1939 *Colophon*, by Manning Hawthorne, seems, however, to have taken some of the bloom off the record of Hawthorne's purely editorial activities. Turner leaves the reader to turn to this quarterly for the epistolary outbursts of the annoyed editor and omits an evaluation of individual issues. The reader would welcome a few of the original illustrations, however inferior, for which Hawthorne supplied text, as well as a Mott-like analysis of the magazine "to whose general purpose he clung." Such report would make clearer than pages of explanation why the material is not more literary than it is.

Though the editor has made no high claim for the selections as literature, he has singled out for comment those passages which rise above the merely practical or encyclopedic and which demonstrate that Hawthorne was a seasoned writer little likely to nod even on drudging, uninspiring tasks. But more valuably he has hinted the significance of these selections in his writing career. Thus he points out parallels to or forestudies of "The Man of Adamant," "Chippings with a Chisel," "Fire Worship," "A Virtuoso's Collection," "The Celestial Railroad," "Main Street," and "A Bell's Biography." The reader can only regret that not more of the contents have such reference value.

The volume, well-documented, supplies a convenient list of the books examined by Hawthorne during 1836, thus greatly supplementing and clarifying the Essex Institute list of 1932. Both through the text and the scholarly aids the volume becomes a new though distinctly minor tool for renewed work in Hawthorne.

G. HARRISON ORIAN

University of Toledo

Milton's Contemporary Reputation. By WILLIAM RILEY PARKER.

Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 299.

Students of the reputations of our great men among their contemporaries, Professor Parker observes, are liable to two errors. The first is the anachronistic error of putting into contemporary minds the judgments of posterity. The other is the error of basing judgments upon negative evidence—of assuming the reputation of a great man to have been slight because not revealed as great by some one of the types of evidence pertinent. The infrequency of published references to Milton during his own lifetime, for example, by this second error becomes proof that Milton was without reputation. Students of Milton's reputation face a third danger, that of accepting Milton's own wishful judgments of his fame. In the essay that gives its title to his book, Parker avoids

all three of these pitfalls and gives us, not (as he insists himself) a complete history of Milton's reputation in England and abroad, but nevertheless a very useful estimate of it at various stages in Milton's career. Occasionally we may disagree as to emphasis. In spite of the credit given a "private acquaintance" in the Council for Milton's appointment as Latin secretary, in two of the early biographies, we may consider the appointment and the literary assignments entrusted to Milton by the Council evidence that Milton's reputation was greater in 1647 than Parker seems to think. But the facts are there, and the reader is free to make his own emphasis.

Chief of the facts, of course, is the valuable list of printed allusions to Milton, 1641-1674, to which the essay is introduction. There are 113 of them, made more meaningful to the reader by the supplementary information in the essay on Milton's reputation and by the brief classification of the allusions in the note prefatory to them. Milton students ought to take seriously Parker's invitation to contribute any further allusions that they may find.

Finally, again with useful notes—bibliographical, explanatory, and critical—, Parker has given us facsimile reproductions of five of the more important pamphlets written in answer to various of Milton's prose works, beginning with *A Modest Confutation* in 1642 and ending with L'Estrange's *No Blinde Guides*, of 1660. Because of the inaccessibility of these pamphlets and others like them, Milton students have too often been in the unhappy situation of judging a debate after hearing only one side. Here is the other side, sometimes badly argued, but very well argued indeed in Filmer's *Observations on Milton against Salmasius*, 1652, and in the anonymous *The Censure of the Rota upon Milton's Book*, 1660. The royalists did not always finish a bad second, even in argument, and it is well for Miltonists to learn it.

JOHN S. DIEKHOF

Queens College

Turgenev in England and America. By ROYAL A. GETTMANN.

Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1941. Pp. 196.

\$1.50 and \$2.00. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xxvii, 2.)

Dr. Gettmann's study of how Turgenev fared among his English and American readers from 1855, when he was introduced to them, to 1937 draws a clear line through much befuddling commentary, tracing interest in his novels from mere curiosity in them as pictures of Russia, to great admiration of their artistry, and finally, with growing knowledge of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, to less certain enthusiasm. It shows how these changing views were related to political developments and to aesthetic controversies of the times:

wars that drew attention to Russia, problems of "realism" in fiction, raised by French novelists and made acute through shocked Victorian sensibilities, questions of dramatic form and of the "well-made" novel. Especially valuable is Dr. Gettmann's analysis of differences between English and American criticism; and his discussions of Turgenev's influence on William Dean Howells, Henry James, George Gissing, and George Moore whet one's appetite for further studies by him in this field.

I cannot feel as Dr. Gettmann does that Turgenev's "value is akin to that of Shakespeare" in correcting extravagances of style, that "when Joyce has exploited his private language to the last syllable, when Dos Passos has run his last news reel, when Dorothy Richardson has done with her interior monologue—then the line of fiction will . . . be found parallel to and not far from that of Turgenev." I am not so sure. Nor am I as impatient as he is with the long-standing controversy as to whether Turgenev was really "Russian" or not, which to my mind is a question not at all "tedious and empty" but very profound, though, to be sure, not always profoundly argued. But these are matters of individual taste and prejudice. Dr. Gettmann's terse, thorough, sensible contribution to the story of how Russian literature has influenced that of the West adds a curious chapter to the history of modern thought.

HELEN MUCHNIC

Northampton, Massachusetts

BRIEF MENTION

An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton. By FRANK ALLEN PATTERSON, assisted by FRENCH ROWE FOGLE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. 2 vols., pp. xxix + 2141. \$12.50. Like many valuable tools, Professor Patterson's *Index* will be dangerous in ignorant or unskilful hands. It is admittedly "far from being" a concordance to Milton's complete works, but, thanks to the loving labor of its compiler, it is the nearest approach to this great *desideratum*, and hence may mislead the unwary. Particularly the student of word usage must beware, for old spellings are not used in all instances, all occurrences of each word listed are not necessarily given, and when a word from Milton's Latin prose has two or more slightly different translations in the Columbia text, the result is separate English entries (hence one needs a good store of synonyms in order to run down facts or ideas). The very generosity of the two fat volumes (more than 170,000 entries in 2141 pages) makes them nearly as awkward as

they are essential. Long entries are frequent, and bewildering. One must accustom himself to an unfamiliar and, in some respects, unfortunate system of abbreviations of Milton's titles.

Presumably one may point out that a truly great work is not faultless and not easy, but to complain of such matters would be inappropriate in a student of Milton. It is the fate of all monumental undertakings to have faults, but a reviewer who dwells on the faults is as ungrateful as a starving man who pauses after the first bite to criticize the cooking. Scholars have long needed such a book. Many hitherto difficult investigations are now immeasurably facilitated, and the next twenty years will see numerous studies made possible by this *Index*, some of which, it is to be hoped, will pay fitting tribute to it. Milton's ideas on a thousand subjects can now be more readily assembled; with this key a sensitive hand can unlock the poet's heart. Indeed, for every serious student of Milton the *Index* is henceforth an indispensable tool.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

The Ohio State University

Der arme Heinrich, a Poem by Hartmann von Ouwe, edited by J. KNIGHT BOSTOCK (*German Mediæval Series*, Section A, vol. 1.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1941. Paper. Pp. 114. 6s. The launching of a German Mediæval Series, almost within the noise of the guns, is worthy of Oxford tradition. This Series, edited by H. G. Fiedler, offers as its initial volume Hartmann's *Der arme Heinrich*. J. Knight Bostock of Oxford here takes Erich Gierach's well known critical text and equips it with detailed explanations in the form of innumerable footnotes with terse, helpful references to standard MHG grammars and MHG authors. The purpose is evident, to provide a useful guide for the beginner and satisfy the particular requirements of English speaking University students. Valuable are the various, pithy chapters on Hartmann's life, works, home, language, style, and the detailed presentation of the poem's moral context, source, metre and extant MSS. A quite comprehensive vocabulary and a note on the MHG Negative conclude this volume. The quality of the paper reminds one of the ill-fated German post-war books.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College of the City of New York

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Altick, Richard D.—Richard Owen Cambridge: belated Augustan. Diss. *Philadelphia, Pa.*: U of Pa, 1941. Pp vi + 160.

Anderson, Maxwell, Carpenter, Rhys, Harris, Roy.—The bases of artistic creation. *New Brunswick, N. J.*: Rutgers U. Press, 1942. Pp. vi + 70. \$1.25 (Pubs. of 175th Anniversary Celebration, 1.)

Daly, Augustin. — *Man and Wife*, and other plays. Ed., with introd. notes and play list, by Catherine Sturtevant *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1942. Pp. xxii + 407. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, xx)

Donne, John.—Complete poems. Ed. Roger E Bennett. *Chicago, Ill.*: Packard, [1942]. Pp. xxx + 306. \$0.95. (University Classics.)

Gover, J. E. B., Mawer, Allen, and Stenton, F. M., Madge, S. J. (collab.).—The place-names of Middlesex, apart from the city of London *Cambridge*: at the University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1942. Pp. xxxiv + 237. \$5.00. (English Place-Name Society, xviii.)

Heywood, Thomas.—An apology for actors (1612). G., I.—A refutation of the *Apology for actors* (1615). Introd. and bibliog. notes by Richard H. Perkinson. *New York*: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1941. Pp. xviii + 64, ix + 66.

Kennedy, Milton Boone.—The oration in Shakespeare. *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, 1942. Pp. x + 270. \$3.00.

Peacham, Henry.—The truth of our times. Reprod. in facsimile from 1638 ed., with introd. by Robert R. Cawley. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1942. Pp. xxiii + 203. \$2.00. (Pubs. of Facsimile Text Society, 55)

Poe, Edgar Allan. — *The Raven*, and other poems. Reprod. in facsimile from Lorimer Graham copy of 1845 ed. with author's corrections, with introd. by Thomas Ollive Mabbott. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1942. Pp. xxviii + facsim. 8 + 96. \$1.80. (Facsimile Text Society, 56.)

Richards, Grant. — Housman, 1897-1936. Introd. by Mrs. E. W. Symons; appendices by G. B. A. Fletcher and others. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1942. Pp. xxii + 493. \$4.00.

Severs, J. Burke.—The literary relationships of Chaucer's *Clerkes Tale*. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 371. \$7.50. (Yale Studies in English, 96.)

Smith, Dora V.—Basic aims for English

instruction. *Chicago, Ill.*: National Council of Teachers of English, [1942]. Pp. 16. (Pamphlet Publication, 3.)

Sypher, Wylie.—Guinea's captive kings: British anti-slavery literature of the XVIIIth century. *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, 1942. Pp. xiv + 340. \$3.00.

Tate, Allen (ed.).—Princeton verse between two wars, an anthology. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1942. Pp. xx + 112. \$2.50

Taylor, Walter Fuller. — The economic novel in America *Chapel Hill, N. C.*: U. of N. C. Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 378. \$4.00.

Wingfield, Fred S. C.—Functional frequencies, vowel letters with vowel sounds. *Chicago, Ill.*: Northwest Printery, [1942] (2nd ed.) Pp. 10.

Woodbury, Benjamin Collins.—A dramatic arrangement of Browning's *Paracelsus*. *Waco, Texas*: Baylor U., 1942. Pp. xviii + 108. (Baylor Bulletin, xlv, 1; Baylor U's Browning Interests, series 13.)

GERMAN

Hagboldt, Peter.—Alle funf! Retold and edited after the German of Helene Stöckl. Book Five—Alternate. [The Heath-Chicago German Series.] *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1942]. 56 pp. \$0.32.

— Eine Nacht im Jägerhaus (Friedrich Hebbel) and Die Geschichte von Kalif Storeh (Wilhelm Hauff) Retold and Edited. Book Four—Alternate. [The Heath-Chicago German Series.] *Boston*: D. C. Heath & Co. [1942]. 56 pp. \$0.32.

Hand, Wayland D.—A Dictionary of Words and idioms associated with Judas Iscariot. A Compilation Based Mainly on Material Found in the Germanic Languages [Univ. of Calif. Publications in Mod. Philol. Vol. 24, No. 3]. *Berkeley*: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1942. Pp. vi, 289-356.

Katalog des Adalbert Stifter-Museums in Wien (zusammengestellt von Fritz Novotny). *Wien*: Schroll, 1941. 31 pp. 50 Pf.

Price, Lawrence M.—Christian Heinrich Schmid and his translations of English Dramas 1767-1789. [Univ. of Calif. Publications in Mod. Philology, Vol. 26, No. 1]. *Berkeley*: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1942. x, 122 pp.

Sumberg, Samuel L. — The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1941. xi, 234 pp.

Wagman, Frederick Herbert.—Magic and Natural Science in German Baroque Literature. A Study in the prose forms of the later seventeenth century. [Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies, No. 13, New Series]. 178 pp. \$2.25.

FRENCH

Coffey, Sister Loyola Maria. — *Adrien Jourdan's Susanna* (1653), a critical ed. of the Latin text with a study of the play and its influence on Brueys's *Gabinie* (1699). *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942. 127 pp. \$1.25. (J H Studies in Romance L and L., 41.)

Dargan, E. P. and Weinberg, B. — *The Evolution of Balzac's Comédie humaine* *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1942. xii + 441 pp. \$5.00.

Descartes. — *Discours de la méthode*. *Manchester, Eng.*: Manchester U. Press. xlv + 94 pp. 3/6

Edwards, Ella I. — *Les Lettres de mon amie* *New York*: Macmillan, 1942. xii + 216 pp. \$1.60.

Fraser, Squair, Parker. — *Revised Elementary French Grammar*. *Boston*: Heath, 1942. xviii + 410 pp. \$1.80.

Goodridge, G. W. F. R. — *Practical Eng.-Fr. Dict* *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. vi + 295 pp. \$1.50.

Healy, D. M. — *French for Soldiers*. *Toronto*: Gage, 1940. 60 pp. \$0.25

Heft, David. — *Proverbs and Sentences in Fifteenth-Century French Poetry*. *Abridgment of N Y U. diss.*, 1942. i + 12 pp.

Jones and Buhler. — *Un Beau Voyage*. *New York*: Allyn and Bacon, 1940 ix + 350 + 91 pp. \$1.60.

Muller. — *Racontez encore*, ed W. J. Walker. *London*: Harrap, 1940. 160 pp. 2 sh.

Musset. — *Lorenzaccio*, ed P. E. Crump *Manchester, Eng.*: Manchester U. Press, 1941 xiv + 128 pp. 3/6.

Noulet, E. — *L'Œuvre poétique de Stéphane Mallarmé*. *Paris*: Droz, 1941. 564 pp.

Peschon, Sister Dorothy Marie. — *A Literary Study of Henri Bremond*. *Abstract of U. of Ill. diss.*, 1941. 15 pp.

Protzman, M. I. — *Les Illustres Fous* of Charles Beys, crit. ed. with a brief account of the author and his works. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942. 211 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L., 42.)

Rouillard, C. D. — *The Turk in French History, Thought and Literature* (1520-1660). *Paris*: Boivin, n. d. [1940 or 1941]. 700 pp (Etudes de litt. étrangère et comparée, 13)

Rousseau. — *Rêveries*, ed. R. Niklaus. *Manchester*: Manchester U. Press, 1941. 3/6.

Saint-Pierre. — *Paul et Virginie*, ed. V. P. Underwood. *Manchester*: Manchester U. Press, 1941. 3/6.

Vidal de la Blache, P. — *La Personnalité géographique de la France*, ed H. J. Fleure *Manchester, Eng.*: Manchester U. Press, 1941. xviii + 60 pp. 8 sh.

ITALIAN

Baldini, G. — *Panzini. Brescia*: "Morcelliana," 1941. 200 pp. L. 12

Bontempelli, M. — *Verga-L'Aretino-Scarlatti-Verdi*. (Nuovi discorsi). *Milano*. Bompiani, 1941. 163 pp. L. 10

D'Amico, S. — *Storia del teatro drammatico*. Vol. IV, Parte V. Il teatro contemporaneo. Appendice Teatri orientali. *Milano*: Rizzoli, 1941 509 pp. L. 80.

Ferrero, L. — *Appunti sul metodo della Divina Commedia*. Del dramma. Dell'arte classica decadente *Lugano*. Nuove Edizioni Capolago, 1941 252 pp. Frs 3.

Fontana, L. — *Giovanni Marradi*. *Roma*: Soc. Ed. Dante Alighieri, 1941. 207 pp. L. 12 60.

Gimmelli, E. — *La poesia di Goldoni* *Pisa*: Vallerini, 1941 122 pp. L. 10.50.

SPANISH

González Peña, C. — *Historia de la lit. mexicana*. *Mexico*: "Cultura," 1940. xvi + 327 pp. 24.5 cms.

Hilton, Ronald. — *Handbook of Hispanic Source Material and Research Organizations in the U. S.* *Toronto*: U. of T. Press, 1942. xvi + 441 pp., lithotyped. \$5.00.

Lewis, W. N. and Chávez, T. H. — *Spanish Verb Key*. *Dallas*: Upshaw, 1940 ix + 117 pp. \$2.00.

Mitchell, Howard. — *Spanish Verb and Idiom Achievement Tests*. *Boston*: Heath. 109 sheets (pad). \$1.00.

Planchart, J. — *Tendencia lirica venezolana a fines del siglo XIX* *Caracas*: Elite, 1940.

Rodó, J. E. — *La tradición intelectual argentina*, ed. A. Arrieta. *Buenos Aires*: 1940.

Sánchez Andrade, J. — *26 poemas de mar, cielo y tierra*, ed. Humberto Mata. *Quito*: Ed. Antorcha, 1939. 62 pp.

Santamaría y Domínguez. *Ensayos críticos de lenguaje*. *Mexico*: Porrúa, 1940. xiii + 302 pp. 20.5 cms.

Shearer, J. F. — *The Poética and Apendices of Martínez de la Rosa*. *Princeton diss.*, 1941. xiv + 137 pp. lithotyped.

Tauro, Alberto. — *El indigenismo a través de la poesía de Alejandro Peralta*. *Lima*: Compañía de impresiones, 1940.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

JUNE, 1942

Number 6

SUR LE SENS DES TITRES DE QUELQUES COMÉDIES DE MOLIERE

Il est fréquent que les comédies du XVII^e siècle portent des titres composés de deux mots juxtaposés dont il est malaisé de déterminer la fonction grammaticale. Ainsi le *Riche Mécontent*, de Chappuzeau (1661). Avons-nous affaire à deux substantifs en apposition, ou à un substantif et un adjectif, et dans ce cas, lequel est le substantif? Avant d'analyser ce petit problème grammatical et ses conséquences littéraires, spécialement en ce qui concerne Molière, essayons d'apprécier l'importance du phénomène et de voir où il se situe de préférence.

D'après les listes que donne M. H. C. Lancaster,¹ on peut voir que sur 777 comédies et tragi-comédies du XVII^e siècle que nous possédons, 260, soit 33.5%, donc plus du tiers, ont des titres formés de deux mots juxtaposés. Le procédé est donc largement répandu.² Les comédies fournissent 200 titres de ce genre sur 546, donc 36.6%, et les tragi-comédies 60 sur 231, soit 25.9%. Le "titre à deux mots" paraît donc plus spécial à la comédie.

Si maintenant nous examinons la répartition par périodes, nous obtenons les résultats suivants:

	1610-1634	1635-1651	1652-1672	1673-1700
Comédies	5 sur 26 19.3%	19 sur 56 33.9%	81 sur 171 47.4%	95 sur 293 32.4%
Tragi- comédies	19 sur 80 23.7%	33 sur 107 30.8%	8 sur 43 18.6%	0 sur 1
Totaux	24 sur 106 22.6%	52 sur 163 31.9%	89 sur 214 41.6%	95 sur 294 32.3%

¹ *A History of French dramatic Literature in the 17th century.*

² Si l'on compte les sous-titres, la proportion est plus forte encore: 110 sous-titres formés de deux mots juxtaposés sur un total de 219 sous-titres, donc 50.2%, soit un peu plus de la moitié. Que M. Lancaster, qui m'a communiqué une liste inédite de sous-titres, et qui m'a aidé par ailleurs de ses précieux conseils, me permette de lui témoigner ici ma reconnaissance.

On remarquera qu'au début du siècle, quand la comédie et la tragi-comédie ne sont pas encore nettement distinguées, le titre à deux mots juxtaposés est plus fréquent dans la tragi-comédie que dans la comédie. Plus tard, le procédé suit assez régulièrement l'évolution et la disparition de la tragi-comédie: le pourcentage de ce genre de titres croît avec le nombre des tragi-comédies (jusqu'en 1651) et décroît ensuite, quand le genre de la tragi-comédie s'étirole et disparaît.

Il n'en est pas tout à fait de même dans le domaine de la comédie. Alors que le nombre des comédies ne cesse de croître au cours du XVII^e siècle, le nombre des "titres à deux mots" croît aussi, mais moins vite. Les deux développements sont à peu près parallèles jusqu'en 1672, la proportion des titres à deux mots augmentant à peu près autant que le nombre des comédies, mais entre 1673 et 1700, si l'on a 95 titres à deux mots, donc plus que les 81 de la période précédente, ils ne forment plus que les 32.4% du total, à comparer avec l'impressionnante proportion de 47.4% à l'époque de Molière. D'autres formes de titres se développent à la fin du siècle, et celle que nous étudions n'est plus aussi répandue par rapport aux autres.

Il s'agit donc d'un procédé important du théâtre classique, quoique relatif à un détail, et dont le terrain d'élection est la comédie, et l'époque d'élection celle de Molière.

Quant à la définition grammaticale du procédé, elle est loin d'être aisée. Il ne suffira point de chercher dans les dictionnaires du XVII^e siècle si les deux mots en question sont généralement employés, à telle ou telle époque, comme adjectifs ou comme substantifs. L'immense majorité des adjectifs du XVII^e siècle peut s'employer, et s'emploie souvent, comme substantifs. C'est même une mode précieuse: "Pousser le doux, le tendre et le passionné."³ "Nous n'avons garde . . . de donner de notre sérieux dans le doux de votre flatterie."⁴ Il nous faudrait donc un critère général qui permette de distinguer l'adjectif du substantif. Bien que les linguistes contemporains insistent sur l'indétermination fondamentale de ces deux catégories grammaticales,⁵ nous pourrions adopter la distinction logique de Jespersen:

³ Molière, *Précieuses Ridicules*, sc. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, sc. 9.

⁵ Voir Vendryès, *Le langage*, II^eme Partie, ch. 3, Différentes espèces de mots, et Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, ch. 5, Substantives and adjectives.

Substantives are more special than adjectives, they are applicable to fewer objects than adjectives, in the parlance of logicians, the extension of a substantive is less and its intension is greater than that of an adjective.*

Compte tenu des possibilités qu'indiquent les dictionnaires, nous verrons donc dans chaque cas si le sens de la pièce autorise à affirmer que l'un des deux mots qui composent le titre a une compréhension plus grande que l'autre, auquel cas il pourra être adjectif, ou bien s'il y a apposition de deux substantifs, et dans ce cas quel est le sens qui s'en dégage.

Il en résulte évidemment que les dimensions de cette étude ne permettent pas de songer à faire cette enquête pour toutes les comédies du XVII^e siècle. Nous nous bornerons à étudier les titres de notre plus grand comique, dont la production coïncide précisément avec la plus grande vogue du procédé, en les éclairant quand il y aura lieu par des rapprochements avec les titres des comédies contemporaines.

* * * *

Sur les 34 comédies de Molière, 14 portent des titres ou des sous-titres formés de deux mots juxtaposés. La plus grande partie de ces 14 titres ne présente à première vue aucune difficulté.

Il ne saurait y avoir aucun doute pour le *Dépit amoureux*, le *Cocu imaginaire*,⁷ le *Mariage forcé*, le *Mari confondu*,⁸ les *Amants magnifiques*, le *Malade imaginaire*. Parfaitement simples au point de vue de la forme, tous ces titres sont composés d'un substantif suivi d'un adjectif épithète. Nous verrons plus loin le sens de tous ces adjectifs.

Non moins clairs sont l'*Amour médecin*, l'*Amour peintre*,⁹ et le *Bourgeois gentilhomme*. Le deuxième mot de chacun de ces titres est un substantif en apposition au premier substantif, et le sens est: L'Amour (représenté par l'amant, Clitandre), qui est un médecin, qui devient médecin, qui se déguise en médecin,—et ainsi des autres.¹⁰

Le cas du *Prince Jaloux*¹¹ est moins évident. Au XVII^e siècle comme aujourd'hui, *jaloux* pouvait être adjectif:

* *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁸ Sous-titre de *George Dandin*.

⁷ Sous-titre de *Sganarelle*.

⁹ Sous-titre du *Sicilien*.

¹⁰ Cf. les titres des traductions du *Bourgeois gentilhomme*: *Der Bürger als Edelmann*, Berlin, 1912, et, plus clair encore: *The cit turned gentleman*, New York, 1933.

¹¹ Sous-titre de *Dom Garçie de Navarre*.

Mon cœur de votre honneur jaloux
Ne fera point rougir un père tel que vous¹²

ou substantif:

Ma jalouse en fureur.¹³

Molière lui-même l'a employé comme substantif:

M'en rendre maître en dépit du jaloux¹⁴

Un jaloux (substantif) est un homme foncièrement jaloux, qui l'est toujours, par nature. Or la jalousie est bien le trait fondamental du caractère de Dom Garcie, défini comme tel dès son entrée en scène (acte I, sc. 3), et l'un des ressorts essentiels de l'intrigue. Par ailleurs, "jaloux," comme terme de théâtre, désignant un type traditionnel et presque un "emploi," se présentait naturellement à l'esprit de Molière comme un substantif.¹⁵ Il est donc naturel de considérer le sous-titre de *Dom Garcie* comme formé de deux substantifs en apposition.

Dans l'*Atrabilaire Amoureux*,¹⁶ les deux termes peuvent être l'un et l'autre substantif ou adjectif:

"Un mélancolique, un atrabilaire".¹⁷ substantif.

"Un homme purement atrabilaire".¹⁸ adjectif.

Et de même:

"S'érigent pour rimer en amoureux transis".¹⁹ substantif.

"Bajazet en est-il amoureux?"²⁰ adjectif

On pourrait d'abord être tenté de raisonner ici comme pour le *Prince Jaloux* et de trouver dans ce titre deux substantifs. Il est exact qu'en français moderne "amoureux" est un terme de théâtre au même titre que "jaloux." Mais le XVII^e siècle employait plutôt "amant" dans ce sens. En outre, sur onze autres titres de comédies ou tragi-comédies classiques où l'on trouve le mot *amou-*

¹² Racine, *Iphigénie*, acte IV, sc. 4.

¹³ Corneille, *Médée*, acte II, sc. 4.

¹⁴ *Ecole des Femmes*, acte I, sc. 4.

¹⁵ Cf. les titres antérieurs, *Le Jaloux sans sujet*, de Beys (1634), et *La Jalouse d'elle-même*, de Boisrobert (1650).

¹⁶ Sous-titre du *Misanthrope*.

¹⁷ Palaprat, *Muet*, I, 4.

¹⁸ Boileau, *Art Poétique*, 2.

¹⁹ Guy Patin, *Lettres*, 196.

²⁰ Racine, *Bajazet*, acte IV, sc. 5.

reux, il est substantif dans 3 cas seulement²¹ et vraisemblablement adjectif dans les 8 autres.²² L'ordre des deux mots apporte une présomption supplémentaire: la place normale de l'adjectif en français est après le nom,²³ et c'est bien la place qu'occupe *amoureux* dans les 8 titres cités, ainsi que dans l'*Atrabilaire amoureux*. Les raisons proprement linguistiques nous amènent donc à penser que *atrabilaire* est substantif et *amoureux* adjectif. Si nous nous référons maintenant au contenu du *Misanthrope*, on nous accordera sans doute aisément qu'Alceste est au premier chef un "atrabilaire"; son amour ne sert qu'à mettre sa misanthropie en valeur en s'opposant à elle, et c'est la misanthropie qui triomphe, après un débat qui n'est qu'un des aspects de la pièce, de l'amour; ce dernier est donc suffisamment indiqué par un adjectif.²⁴

Pour les *Femmes Savantes*, on ne se pose généralement pas le problème que nous étudions ici. On admet, sans y réfléchir davantage, que *savantes* est un adjectif. C'est pourquoi on traduit le titre en anglais par *The Learned Ladies*²⁵ et en allemand par *Die gelehrten Frauen*.²⁶ Pourtant, *savante* peut être substantif. Pour la forme masculine, *savant*, son emploi comme substantif est ancien et courant dans la langue. Il n'en est pas de même pour *savante*, parce que la réalité qu'elle désigne est relativement récente. Avant l'épanouissement de la Préciosité, et le développement du féminisme qui l'accompagne,²⁷ les femmes pouvaient être à l'occasion *savantes*,

²¹ L'*Amoureux extravagant*, sous-titre de la *Place Royale*, de Corneille (1634), la pièce du même nom de Françoise Pascal (1657) et L'*Amoureuse vaine et ridicule*, également de Françoise Pascal et de 1657.

²² L'*Indienne amoureuse*, de du Rocher (1631). La *Pélerine amoureuse*, de Rotrou (1637). Le *Docteur amoureux*, de Le Vert (1638). Le *Fantôme amoureux*, de Quinault (1656). Le *Vieillard amoureux*, de Françoise Pascal (1664). Les *Barbons amoureux*, de Chevalier (1662). Le *Pédagogue amoureux*, du même (1665). La *Dupe amoureuse*, de Rosimond (1671).

²³ Brunot et Bruneau, *Précis de Grammaire historique de la langue française*, p. 305.

²⁴ On peut rappeler ici la définition de Mansion, *Reference French Grammar*, p. 194: l'adjectif se place après le nom s'il sert à distinguer l'objet: encre rouge, eau froide, angle droit. Alceste est du genre *atrabilaire* et de l'espèce *amoureux*.

²⁵ Londres, 1714.

²⁶ Bremen, 1854.

²⁷ Cf. Bauman, *Le féminisme au temps de Molière*, passim.

on n'avait pas l'habitude de voir en elles *des* savantes. Et chez la plupart des écrivains classiques, l'emploi de ce mot comme substantif, au féminin, n'est pas exempt d'une certaine ironie:

Cette savante
Qu'estime Roberval et que Sauveur fréquente.
D'où vient qu'elle a l'œil trouble et le teint si terni? ²⁸

Molière l'avait employé ainsi dès l'*Ecole des Femmes*:

Héroïnes du temps, Mesdames les Savantes,
Pousseuses de tendresse et de beaux sentiments . . . ²⁹

C'est précisément l'opposition qui existe, dans l'esprit de ces auteurs, entre l'idée de femme et l'idée de savante, qui peut nous faire pencher à voir dans ce dernier terme un substantif. L'apposition aurait ici pour but de rapprocher deux idées contradictoires. Le procédé qui consiste à mettre en valeur une antinomie dans un titre était déjà visible dans le *Prince Jaloux* (car, d'après les idées précieuses que suit Molière dans cette pièce,³⁰ la jalousie est indigne d'un "honnête homme," et à plus forte raison de la grande âme d'un prince) et dans l'*Atrabilaire amoureux*. Il s'impose bien plus ici, puisque cette antinomie est le sujet de la pièce. Stendhal, longtemps avant qu'il fût devenu un homme de lettres, l'avait bien vu et bien dit: "Ici Molière voudrait rendre ridicule aux yeux de tous, et d'une manière très aisée à comprendre, un mal moral (selon lui) qui consiste à ce qu'une femme soit savante."³¹ Et encore: "La qualité de savante détruit net la grâce, l'extermine partout."³² Cette opposition dans les titres est d'ailleurs fréquente dans les comédies du XVII^e siècle, au point de devenir un véritable cliché. Citons: *La Fille Capitaine*, de Montfleury (1672), *La Fille Viceroi*, de Nanteuil (1672), où il s'agit d'emplois jugés incompatibles avec le beau sexe;³³ et plus généralement: *L'Amie Rivale*, sous-titre de la

²⁸ Boileau, *Satires*, x.

²⁹ Acte I, sc. 3.

³⁰ Cf. Bauman, *Molière auteur précieux*, surtout ch. 3.

³¹ *Molière, Shakespeare, la comédie et le rire*, éd. Martineau, p. 7.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³³ Ce type se développe naturellement après Molière, à mesure qu'on reconnaît la place de plus en plus considérable que prennent les femmes dans la société: *La Dame médecin*, de Montfleury (1678), *Colombine avocat*, de Fatouville (1685), *Isabelle médecin*, du même (1685), *La Fille savante*, du même (1690), *La Fille médecin*, anonyme (1697).

Galerie du Palais, de Corneille (1633), les *Rivaux amis*, de Boissier (1638), les *Galantes Vertueuses*, de Desfontaines (1642), les *Innocents coupables*, de Brosse (1645), *Jodelet ou le Maître Valet*, de Scarron (1645), les *Morts Vivants*, de d'Ouville (1646), et toutes les pièces inspirées de ce thème italien, l'*Aveugle clairvoyant*, de Brosse (1650), l'*Heureux Infortuné*, sous-titre des *Coups d'amour*, de Boissier (1655), les *Amis Ennemis*, sous-titre d'*Armetzar*, de Chappuzeau (1657), le *Fou raisonnable*, de Poisson (1664), etc. . . . Desfontaines semble spécialiste du procédé. Outre sa tragi-comédie des *Galantes Vertueuses*, il a écrit deux romans qui ont pour titres: *Les heureuses infortunes de Céliante et Marlinde, veuves pucelles* (1636) et *L'Inceste innocent* (1638).³⁴

Il existe donc au XVII^e siècle une très forte tendance à l'opposition dans l'apposition, si l'on peut s'exprimer ainsi, et ce procédé s'appliquait particulièrement bien au sujet des *Femmes Savantes*. Mais nous avons une raison plus spéciale de considérer ici *savantes* comme un substantif. Si en effet Molière avait voulu faire de ce mot un adjectif, négligeant ainsi, contre toute vraisemblance, de mettre l'opposition en valeur, le mot *Femmes* perdait toute raison d'être, et Molière devait écrire simplement: *Les Savantes*. Il avait ainsi le choix entre un substantif et deux substantifs, ce dernier tour plus expressif par le contraste qu'il suggère. Il a choisi les deux substantifs. Il ne pouvait être question d'un substantif et d'un adjectif. On affaiblit donc considérablement le sens de la pièce quand on comprend *savantes* comme un adjectif. Par suite, la véritable traduction en anglais serait, non *The Learned Ladies*, mais *The Ladies Scholars*.

Le cas des *Précieuses Ridicules* est le plus épineux de tous. Comme dans *Atrabilaire amoureux*, nous avons affaire à deux mots qui peuvent être l'un et l'autre adjectif ou substantif. *Précieux*, d'abord adjectif: "L'air précieux n'a pas seulement infecté Paris"³⁵ s'est substantivé pour la même raison que *savante*: "Les véritables précieuses."³⁶ Quant à *ridicule*, s'il est courant comme adjectif:

On sera ridicule et je n'oserai rire!³⁷

³⁴ Il n'est pas inutile de rappeler ici que Desfontaines fut l'un des principaux fournisseurs de l'*Illustre Théâtre*.

³⁵ Molière, *Précieuses ridicules*, sc. I.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, Préface.

³⁷ Boileau, *Satires*, IX.

il ne faut pas oublier qu'il est extrêmement employé aussi au XVII^e siècle comme substantif. Les exemples en abondent dans Molière :

On m'en a parlé comme d'un ridicule.³⁸

Cléante . . . a bien paru ridicule achevé.³⁹

La constance n'est bonne que pour des ridicules.⁴⁰

Nous devons donc, pour déterminer la fonction des deux mots, nous demander si les héroïnes de la pièce sont essentiellement précieuses ou essentiellement ridicules. Bien qu'elles soient constamment et précieuses et ridicules, il semble évident que Molière a voulu montrer que leur ridicule est la cause de leur préciosité, et non le contraire. Elles sont devenues précieuses parce qu'elles étaient ridicules, elles ne sont pas devenues ridicules à cause d'une préciosité qu'elles ne connaissent que d'hier. Il ressort clairement des déclarations de Molière dans la Préface et de celles de Gorgibus dans la pièce que le but est de montrer les ravages que produit la préciosité quand deux provinciales sans bon sens s'en entichent, et non de prétendre que la préciosité mène toujours et nécessairement au ridicule. L'eût-il cru, Molière débutant ne pouvait prendre cette position devant le public précieux qui a contribué au succès de sa pièce, et pour lequel il a toujours eu des égards.⁴¹

Si donc Cathos et Magdelon sont ridicules avant d'être précieuses, il en résulte, pour notre titre, que *ridicules* doit être substantif. Mais ceci amène une conséquence imprévue : si *précieuses* est adjectif, il doit, conformément aux habitudes de la langue, être placé après le nom, et Molière aurait dû dire : *Les Ridicules Précieuses*. Si *précieuses* est un substantif juxtaposé à *ridicules* et moins important que lui, il doit aussi se placer après lui, comme dans le *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, le *Prince Jaloux*, les *Femmes Savantes*, et cent autres titres en dehors de Molière. L'optique du théâtre exige en effet qu'on présente tout de suite au spectateur le caractère essentiel, pour éviter d'entraîner son esprit dans une fausse direction.

Dans l'un et l'autre cas, Molière aurait donc dû intituler sa pièce : *Les Ridicules Précieuses*. Pourquoi ne l'a-t-il pas fait ? Parce que *ridicule* n'est pas aussi stable comme substantif que *bourgeois* ou *prince*, ou tout autre mot qui ne peut être que substantif. Si dans

³⁸ *Ecole des Femmes*, acte I, sc. 4.

³⁹ *Dom Juan*, acte I, sc. 2.

⁴⁰ *Misanthrope*, acte II, sc. 4.

⁴¹ Cf. Bauman, *op. cit.*, passim.

Les Ridicules Précieuses, on est tenté de prendre *ridicules* pour un adjectif, on fait alors de *précieuses* un substantif, et le sens change du tout au tout.⁴² L'adjectif placé avant le nom est banal et non accentué (*petits enfants, bon garçon*) et tend à former groupe avec lui (*petit pois, gentilhomme*). Il en résulte inévitablement que l'adoption du titre *Les Ridicules Précieuses* signifiera que toutes les *précieuses* sont *ridicules*, si l'on a le malheur, comme il n'est pas impossible, de faire de *précieuses* le nom et de *ridicules* l'adjectif. C'est une catastrophe! Molière ne pouvait risquer une pareille équivoque, ni offrir de gaîté de cœur à ses détracteurs la possibilité d'une interprétation aussi maligne, et pourtant aussi facile à donner et aussi naturelle, à cause du double emploi de *ridicule*.

Il a donc dû se résigner au titre *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, où *précieuses* est naturellement compris dès l'abord comme un substantif, puisqu'il est le premier mot et qu'il peut être substantif.⁴³ Faisons-nous de *ridicules* un second substantif? Le sens serait alors, comme dans *l'Amour peintre*, le *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, etc. . . . : les *précieuses* qui jouent à être *ridicules*, ou qui veulent se faire passer pour *ridicules*; idée qu'il suffit d'exprimer pour en voir l'absurdité. Il faut donc voir en *ridicules* un simple adjectif, comme dans *l'Héritier ridicule*, de Scarron (1650), *l'Amant ridicule*, de Boisrobert (1655), le *Marquis ridicule*, de Scarron (1656), *l'Amoureuse vaine et ridicule*, de Françoise Pascal (1657).⁴⁴ Au lieu du sens fort et

⁴² Cf. Mansion, *Reference French Grammar*, pp. 194 sqq

⁴³ Pour un raisonnement analogue, cf. Lucien Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français*, pp. 92-105.

⁴⁴ Malgré les nécessités grammaticales qui obligeaient Molière à faire de *ridicules* un adjectif, la tendance à en faire un substantif était si forte, si naturelle pour un esprit du XVII^e siècle, et si en accord avec le sens de la pièce que c'est comme substantif que Saint-Evremond l'emploie dans ses *Stances à Ninon de Lenclos*:

"Molière en vain eût cherché dans la Cour
Ses *Ridicules* affectées;
Et ses *Fâcheux* n'auraient pas vu le jour,
Manque d'objets à fournir les idées."

On ne saurait penser à tirer de ce passage une objection à notre manière de voir. Saint-Evremond, suivant l'habitude constante du XVII^e siècle, ne cite pas exactement, il fait seulement allusion au titre en citant le mot qui l'a le plus frappé; et ce mot étant isolé se présente nécessairement comme un substantif. Que d'ailleurs Saint-Evremond ne se pique pas ici d'exactitude, c'est ce que montre assez la grosse erreur qui cherche les

expressif que le titre à deux mots semble permettre, et qu'il donnera dans l'*Atrabilaire amoureux* ou les *Femmes Savantes*, il semble glisser ici entre les mains de Molière et ne laisser comme résidu qu'un titre banal, inspiré par des analogies contemporaines. Faut-il en accuser la relative inexpérience de Molière? Ou ne faut-il pas plutôt en trouver la cause dans les difficultés propres à ce titre? Il semble bien en effet, on l'a assez vu par cet exemple, qu'à partir d'un certain degré d'indéfinition grammaticale, le titre à deux mots entraîne à des complications presque inextricables.

On serait assez tenté d'appliquer les mêmes idées au *Médecin Volant*. C'est Faguet qui nous le suggère: "Le titre ne peut pas être expliqué avec une entière certitude, écrit-il. Je crois qu'il faut l'entendre dans le sens de médecin improvisé. Les faux soldats, hommes que l'on engageait pour un jour afin de les faire figurer dans une revue et de combler les vides de la compagnie, s'appelaient *pas-se-volants*. Le Sganarelle du *Médecin Volant*, comme plus tard celui du *Médecin malgré lui*, est un figurant, un faux docteur, un médecin improvisé pour la circonstance; de là son nom de *Médecin Volant*. Il est probable que c'est là l'interprétation véritable."⁴⁵ On remarquera l'hésitation de Faguet, et ses formules restrictives. Il ne semble pas être bien convaincu lui-même de son hypothèse. Elle ne laisse pas d'être séduisante. Le malheur est qu'aucun dictionnaire du XVII^e siècle ne donne ce sens pour *volant*. C'est *pas-se-volant* seul qui signifie faux soldat qu'on engage pour combler les vides dans une revue. Quant à *volant*, aucun des sens qu'il peut avoir comme substantif ne convient ici. C'est donc un adjectif, qui signifie: qui peut aller d'une place à une autre, comme dans *feuilles volantes*, *table volante*, *escalier volant*, *pont volant*, *camp volant*.⁴⁶ La comparaison avec l'italien *Il medico volante* suffirait d'ailleurs à l'attester. Il n'y a donc pas lieu, pour cette pièce, de modifier l'interprétation traditionnelle.

* * * *

Sur les 14 titres que nous avons étudiés, 9 sont formés d'un substantif et d'un adjectif, et 5 de deux substantifs en apposition. C'est là une proportion considérable de substantifs, si l'on songe que

"*Ridicules*" en question "dans la Cour": on sait de reste que ce sont des "pèques provinciales."

⁴⁵ *En lisant Molière*, p. 12.

⁴⁶ Littré.

l'apposition du substantif à un autre substantif est un tour relativement exceptionnel en français, comparé à l'emploi courant et naturel de l'adjectif épithète. Cette importance du substantif ne peut guère s'expliquer par ce qu'on appellera au XIX^{ème} et au XX^{ème} siècles le "style substantif": Alf. Lombard⁴⁷ a bien montré pour quelles raisons ce procédé est essentiellement moderne. Mais elle peut être mise en rapport avec une des tendances principales du classicisme. Un nom précisé par une épithète semble promettre la peinture d'un caractère particulier, original, bizarre, alors que le but de l'art classique est de peindre l'humanité par des traits généraux, compréhensibles pour tous. Au contraire deux substantifs, indiquant la coexistence en un même individu de deux caractères permanents, qui peuvent se compléter, s'opposer, se continuer l'un en l'autre, ou entretenir entre eux tout autre rapport que l'on voudra, semblent mieux capables de répondre aux exigences de l'enquête classique sur l'homme.

Même dans le groupe substantif-adjectif, ces exigences trouvent à se satisfaire. On peut le faire voir en montrant qu'il n'y a presque pas dans nos titres d'adjectif pur, irréductible, que presque tous ces adjectifs peuvent être remplacés par des noms et expriment généralement des idées plus complexes que celles dévolues d'ordinaire à de simples épithètes. Le *Mariage Forcé*, c'est l'*Intimidation*, ou l'*Abus de pouvoir*. Le *Mari confondu*, c'est la *Tromperie*. Les *Amants Magnifiques*, ce sont les *Grands Seigneurs Amants*. Certains de ces adjectifs, si on voulait les interpréter strictement comme tels, n'auraient guère de sens, ou leur sens porterait à faux. Ce n'est pas le mariage qui est forcé, c'est le héros qui est forcé . . . de se marier. Ce ne sont pas les amants qui sont magnifiques, il s'agit seulement d'évoquer vaguement une cour galante. Et ce ne sont pas les précieuses, on l'a assez vu, qui sont ridicules. Quant au *Dépit amoureux*, c'est un titre qui n'a à proprement parler aucun sens. On ne peut guère le comprendre qu'en partant de *Les amoureux dépités* ou *Les amoureux par dépit*. Ce titre normal est transformé par la volonté d'abstraire et de renfermer dans le substantif l'idée essentielle, procédé que la rhétorique nomme hypallage. Tous ces emplois de l'adjectif et du substantif tendent, à des degrés divers, vers l'hypallage.

⁴⁷ *Les constructions nominales dans le français moderne*, surtout Partie Générale.

Quant aux rapports que les deux substantifs (ou les deux idées substantives) qui forment le plus souvent le titre, entretiennent entre eux, il est aisé de voir qu'ils peuvent se classer en deux grandes catégories: opposition et déguisement. Nous avons donné de nombreux exemples d'opposition caractérisée.⁴⁸ Mais souvent aussi les deux éléments du titre, qui paraissent simplement hétérogènes, ou surprenants par leur rapprochement, prêtent à une opposition virtuelle, seulement indiquée, mais qu'un peu de réflexion dégage aisément. Nous l'avons suggéré pour le *Prince Jaloux* et l'*Atrabilaire amoureux*. On peut remarquer aussi cette nuance d'opposition dans bien d'autres titres où elle ne frappe pas au premier coup d'œil: l'*Infidèle Confidente*, de Pichou (1631), l'*Aveugle Amante*, sous-titre de la *Sœur valeureuse*, de Mareschal (1634), l'*Amante ennemie*, de Sallebray (1642), le *Vieillard amoureux*, de Françoise Pascal (1663), la *Mère Coquette*, de Qumault, et celle de de Visé, toutes deux de 1665, le *Soldat Poltron*, sous-titre du *Soldat malgré lui*, de Chevalier (1667), etc. . . .

Le déguisement, s'il ne nous présente que trois exemples grammaticalement indiscutables dans les titres de Molière (l'*Amour médecin*, l'*Amour peintre* et le *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*), se trouve en fait partout dans son œuvre. Son origine doit être cherchée dans la comédie italienne,⁴⁹ dans le roman romanesque du début du siècle, dont le contenu passera en partie dans la tragi-comédie, et de là dans la comédie, et surtout dans la farce, dont l'importance pour la formation de la technique de Molière n'est plus à démontrer depuis l'article de Lanson;⁵⁰ à partir de là, le véritable déguisement, employé comme ressort de l'intrigue ou comme procédé comique, se répand à foison dans son œuvre. Dans les comédies de caractère, le déguisement se fait psychologique: Tartuffe est un intrigant qui se fait passer pour dévot, Dom Juan joue différents personnages pour séduire ou pour tromper, et c'est pour n'avoir pas accepté les déguisements de la sincérité qu'impose la société qu'Alceste est ridicule et malheureux. Il est également significatif que les deux

⁴⁸ Dans de rares cas, l'opposition s'indique par une proposition relative au lieu d'une apposition. les *Menteurs qui ne mentent pas*, sous-titre des *Nicandres* de Boursault (1663), les *Malades qui se portent bien*, sous-titre de la *Désolation des Filoux*, de Chevalier (1661).

⁴⁹ Cf. *Duoi Fratelli Rivali*, de Della Porta, et *I Morti Vivi*, de Sforza d'Oddi.

⁵⁰ Molière et la farce, *Revue de Paris*, mai 1901.

seuls sujets que Molière ait empruntés explicitement à l'Antiquité, *Amphitryon* et *Psyché*, soient fondés sur le déguisement par excellence, celui que les dieux seuls peuvent réaliser à la perfection. De là encore la nécessité de distinguer soigneusement, et parfois même, pour éviter les erreurs du public, lourdement, entre le déguisement et ce qu'il recouvre, entre la réalité et son imitation : les déclarations de la Préface des *Précieuses*,⁵¹ les laborieuses métaphores du *Tartuffe*⁵² en sont les exemples les plus connus. Si donc ce thème est essentiel chez Molière, il n'est pas étonnant de le retrouver dans les titres sous la forme de deux substantifs accouplés. Cette forme n'est naturellement pas particulière à Molière, et les exemples en abondent autour de lui : *Le Prince Corsaire*, de Scarron (1662), *l'Amour Sentinelle*, de Nanteuil (1668), le *Savetier Avocat*, sous-titre de *l'Avocat sans Etude*, de Rosimond (1669), etc. . . .⁵³

Mais l'origine de ces deux thèmes, goût classique de l'analyse psychologique pour l'opposition, et procédé de farce pour le déguisement, ne suffirait pas à rendre compte de l'importance qu'ils prennent chez Molière. S'il en a fait une utilisation aussi intensive, c'est qu'il a reconnu en eux deux grands moyens du théâtre, et pas seulement de la comédie. Le théâtre, le drame au sens grec, est essentiellement une action, une lutte. Cette lutte entre les personnages, le théâtre classique s'est donné pour tâche de l'intérioriser, de la faire passer dans le cœur des protagonistes, et c'est à Corneille que l'on fait gloire, à juste titre, d'avoir inauguré cette révolution. Qu'est-ce que *Le Cid*, sinon *L'Amant Parricide*, ou *L'Assassin amoureux*? Et l'on pourrait s'amuser à rebaptiser bien des pièces classiques de cette façon. Et il y a une autre méthode pour triompher que la lutte ouverte : c'est le déguisement, c'est-à-dire en

⁵¹ On peut y voir que Molière a eu nettement conscience du procédé et de son importance : " Ces vicieuses imitations de ce qu'il y a de plus parfait ont été de tout temps la matière de la comédie "

⁵² Acte I, sc. 5.

⁵³ Après Molière, le procédé se développe en se stylisant ; le *Gentilhomme meunier*, anonyme (1679), *Crispin musicien*, de Hauteroche (1674), *Crispin gentilhomme*, de Montfleury (1675), *Crispin précepteur* (1679) et *Crispin bel esprit* (1681), de La Tuillerie, *Arlequin procureur* (1682), *Arlequin lingère* (1682), *Arlequin Prothée* (1683) et *Arlequin Jason* (1684), de Fatouville, *Merlin peintre* (1687), de La Tuillerie, *Arlequin Roland furieux*, de Bordelon (1694), *Polichinel Colun Maillar*, et *Polichinel Grand Turque*, de Gillot (1695). Rien que par ces titres, on peut voir qu'après la souplesse psychologique que Molière a introduite dans le déguisement, il y a un retour aux personnages stéréotypés de la farce.

termes psychologiques le mensonge. Ce qu'il faut évoquer ici, c'est surtout la "perfidie" des héros raciniens, si bien mise en lumière par Péguy,⁵⁴ sans parler de Beaumarchais, de Bernard Shaw, de Pirandello,—et de Corneille lui-même. . . .

Nous sommes maintenant en mesure d'interpréter les données statistiques que nous avons présentées au début de cette étude. Le déguisement est un procédé constant du roman romanesque du début du XVII^e siècle, et il passe de là dans la tragi-comédie, dont la comédie, au commencement, ne se distingue guère.⁵⁵ C'est sans doute une des origines du titre à deux mots. L'opposition également est un des procédés par lesquels les précieux du temps de Louis XIII s'efforcent d'analyser leurs sentiments.⁵⁶ Là encore, le titre à deux mots, né d'une mode passagère, fraie le chemin du classicisme. Et c'est parce qu'il est éminemment propre aux desseins du classicisme qu'il se développe surtout dans la comédie, à mesure que celle-ci devient un genre original et dont l'ambition, avec Molière, est de peindre les hommes, et non plus seulement de faire rire.⁵⁷ Mais le vrai classicisme est rare. Dans la mesure où la comédie après Molière cherche le social ou le comique plus que l'humain, ce genre de titre devient comparativement moins fréquent.

Pour en revenir à Molière, et pour terminer, on peut apprécier l'excellence théâtrale de ces titres. Ils sont simples, ou du moins ils l'étaient, sauf complication grammaticale exceptionnelle, pour les auditeurs de son temps; ils sont adaptés à leur milieu et à leur époque, puisqu'ils rappellent des tendances, des habitudes, des modes, du théâtre du XVII^e siècle; et enfin ils condensent en des formules brèves et frappantes quelques-uns des moyens, des centres cachés, des lignes de force, si l'on veut, du théâtre de tous les temps. Ils sont bien d'un génie essentiellement scénique.

New York City

JACQUES SCHERER

⁵⁴ Victor Marie Comte Hugo, *passim*.

⁵⁵ Exemples: *La Pèlerine amoureuse*, de Rotrou (1632), le *Prince déguisé*, de Scudéry (1634), etc. . . .

⁵⁶ On en trouve un écho, parmi beaucoup d'autres, dans l'alliance de mots racinienne. Des vers comme

" Dans une longue enfance ils l'auraient fait vieillir " (*Britannicus*, I, 2)

" Mon unique espérance est dans mon désespoir " (*Bajazet*, acte I, sc. 4) doivent au moins autant à Mlle de Scudéry qu'à Tacite.

⁵⁷ La " bienséance " interdit cette forme de titre, grammaticalement trop hardie, à la tragédie

THE USE OF *a* AS A DESIGNATION OF THE PERSONAL ACCUSATIVE IN SPANISH

In his article "Rum. *p(r)e*, Span. *a* vor persönlichem Akkusativobjekt" (*ZRPh* XLVIII [1928], 423-32), Professor Spitzer seeks to discover the reason for the use of a preposition as a sign of the accusative. He is not satisfied with Pușcariu's observation (*Daco-romania* II, 565)¹ in regard to Rumanian that this usage was adopted as a means to avoid ambiguity by distinguishing between subject and object; before this construction was used in wholesale fashion to serve a utilitarian purpose, it must first, according to Professor Spitzer, have been introduced in special cases to give an affective nuance. Basing himself on Pușcariu's own testimony for Rumanian and upon such Latin-Spanish examples of the tenth century as *si unus ad alium . . . percuserit* he concludes that the special cases in both languages must have involved acts of violence and that the affective connotation of both *p(r)e* and *ad* is tied up with the idea of 'the sphere'—an idea which, in the main, is applicable only to animate beings. To his theory of 'the sphere' as a general explanation of the extension of prepositional usage, I should like to add, in the following lines, certain specific observations about old Spanish usage which may serve to suggest a modification of Professor Spitzer's thesis and a restriction of its application.

In his discussion of the significance of the prepositional construction in Spanish and Rumanian, between which two languages he attempts no distinction, Professor Spitzer does not analyze cases in which both constructions are at hand; he does, however, compare the alternation in German of such forms as *ein-*, *loschauen auf* and *hauen*, *schliessen auf* and *beschiessen*. Though this language, obviously, cannot be said to possess a 'prepositional accusative,' he sees in a *schliessen auf*, etc. basically the same phenomenon that is to be met with, on a much larger scale, and grammaticised, in Spanish and Rumanian. And his analysis brings to light the ever-present distinction between a direct object (which must immediately and completely suffer the consequence of the subject's activity) and a prepositional complement (in which the object once-removed

¹ His article, under the title "Au sujet de *p(r)e* avec l'accusatif," is now available in *Études de linguistique roumaine*, Bucarest 1939, pp. 439-57.

enjoys a relative independence and immunity): cf. *der Feind beschoss die Stadt* vs *der Feind schoss auf die Stadt*. Such an example cannot, of course, serve to illustrate the notion of a *personal* sphere since in German no distinction is made, in this connection, between animate and inanimate object; for this particular notion, involving a particular affective nuance, we must turn to the Romance languages.

But it seems to me clear that the two Romance languages in question are not to be discussed in the same terms. In the first place the construction with *p(r)e* originally involved simply the use of a preposition with an intransitive verb; the development in Rumanian may be described as follows, if we amplify somewhat the explanation given by Pușcariu and illustrate it with parallels drawn from English: the verb *to rule* may be used both transitively and intransitively ('he ruled her' or 'he ruled [wisely]'); in its absolute use, *to rule*, as is true of intransitive verbs in general, may receive an adverbial complement in the form of a prepositional phrase that serves to qualify the action by a reference to its manner, its extent, etc. ('he ruled with an iron hand,' 'he ruled over certain persons'). In the last case we have to do with an expression which has the same meaning as the combination of transitive verb and direct object ('he ruled over her'—'he ruled her'), only that the construction with preposition has a more forceful, a 'larger' connotation. Once the two constructions came to be felt as representing alternate expressions of the same idea, it became possible in Rumanian for a similar alternation to be adopted, by analogy, for purely transitive verbs ('he conquered her'—*'he conquered over her'); because of its greater affective nuance the prepositional construction tended to displace the other in the case of a personal object. And thereby the stage was set for the ultimate extension of the use of *p(r)e*, with transitive verbs in general, as a sign of a personal accusative. But, as regards Spanish, it would be quite gratuitous to assume, for example, that with *recibir a alguno* we have to do with an intransitive *recibir* = 'to give a reception'; nor have I found any evidence to indicate that, originally, it was with transitive-intransitive verbs that *a* flourished (so that its use with pure transitives must be taken to represent only an analogical development).²

² Thus, from the point of view of construction, Rumanian is better to be compared with German than with Spanish; in Rumanian and German

In the second place, the use of *p(r)e* was originally characteristic of verbs of conquest and attack; indeed the meaning of this preposition, which in Old Rumanian was frequent as a synonym of *spre* (< *super*) and *asupra*, readily suggests hostile activity, as do also Eng. *over* and German *über* (Professor Spitzer discusses the implications of this last preposition and its extension in German). But *ad* had no hostile connotation in Latin (for this, *in* and *contra* were at hand), nor could the preposition have developed in this direction in Spanish where, as in most of the Romance languages, *a* has become a designation of the Dative. Professor Spitzer, however, does not discriminate between the two prepositions and assumes that the *a*- construction in Spanish, like the *p(r)e*- construction in Rumanian, developed with verbs of violence (which describe "the intrusion into the sphere of another person"). But if we examine the usage of the *Poema de Mio Cid* we find little evidence to support such an assumption: *vencer* and *matar*, for example, the two most frequent verbs of hostile implication, are usually followed by a direct object.

What, then, are the implications of Spanish *a*, and in what circumstances is the prepositional construction most apt to be found? In regard to the first point, I would compare *a*, not with *p(r)e* or *über* but with English *toward* (or Fr. *envers*). At its most negative, *toward* implies an attitude, of whatever sort, on the part of the subject in regard to the object; it is indicative of a relationship existing between the two. This relationship may be without affective concomitants; it may possibly be hostile; usually, however, it is a friendly one,³ and it may be said, in general, that *toward* implies an 'appreciation' of the personality of another.

And, though English construction offers no parallel to the Spanish prepositional accusative, it is this same connotation of appreciation, of personal concern, that is to be found with O. Sp. *a*: in the *Cid* this preposition appears as a sort of title, emphasizing the individuality of the object, suggesting, for the most part, a ceremonious attitude on the part of the subject. It is the first connotation which is the more strikingly obvious: whenever the object is in the singular, *a* is usually to be found; it is *always* to be found,

alike the presence of the preposition is first to be explained by reference to intransitive verbs.

³ Cf. 'his kindness *toward* me' vs 'his violence *against* me' (Lat. *amicitia erga me*—*inimicitia contra me*).

according to my examples, when a proper name is the object.⁴ The direct object, on the contrary, is reserved for a mass of persons:⁵

direct object

traedes estas dueñas por o valdremos más 1521
 mas quando sacaron mis fijas de Valençia la mayor 3151
 Porque dexamos sus fijas aun no nos repentimos 3357
 priso dozientos cavalleros escollechos a mano 935a
 por tan biltadamientre venger reyes del campo 1863
 demandemos sus fijas pora con elles casar 1882
 Los moros e las moras vender non los podremos 619
 envió dos cavalleros que sopiessen la verdad 1495
 Dio tres cavalleros Minaya Albar Fañez,
 enviólos a mio Cid 1405-6

prepositional object

A este don Jerome yal otorgan por obispo 1303 ['elect']
 quando al rey de Marruecos assí lo an arrancado 1741 ['put to fight']
 al comde don Remont a preson le a tomado 1009
 Al rey don Alfons en Sant Fagunt lo falló 2922
 (rogando) que a mio Cid el Campeador que Dios le curiás de male 329
 ellos comdes gallizanos a él tienen por señor 2926
 salvest a Jonás, quando cayó en la mare
 salvest a Daniel con los leones en la mala cárgel . . .
 resugitest a Lázaro . . . 339-40
 Los que quisieren ir servir al Campeador
 de mí sean quitos . . . 1369-70⁶

⁴ The use of *a* before proper nouns is also to be found in Corsican. Bottiglioni (according to Robert A. Hall, Jr, *Bibliography of Italian Linguistics*, n° 3126) gives as one of the two outstanding features of this dialect the use of the prepositional accusative in the case of proper names and pronouns.

⁵ A difference in word-order between these two groups of examples may be noted: whereas the prepositional object is to be found either before or after the verb, the direct object regularly follows, relegated to a position of lesser relief. There is, in the *Cid* no hard and fast rule to this effect (of *quinze moros matava* below); by the sixteenth century, however, usage had become standardized: according to H. Keniston (*The Syntax of Castilian Prose*, Chicago 1937, p 11) only the *prepositional* accusative "of any noun" could precede the verb.

⁶ It might seem that here we have to do with an intransitive verb plus indirect object. That a *servire ad* had developed in Vulgar Latin is indicated by the presence of *servire a* in Old Italian (which, for the most part, possessed no prepositional accusative); in Modern French, too, *servir à qqn.* ('to be of service to someone') alternates with *servir qqn.* ('to be in the

vidolos el rey e coñoscio a Muño Gustioz 2932
 enbair le cuydan a mio Cid el Campeador 3012
 biltar se quiere e ondrar a so señor 3026

Compare also:

Quando vido mio Cid asomar a	Si viéredes yentes venir por con-
Minaya 919	nusco ir 388
Todos los días a mio Cid aguarda-	las noches e los días las dueñas
van 839	aguardava 1547
Mató a Búcar, al rey de allén	quinze moros matava de los que
mar 2425	alcançava 472

In the case of both singular and plural object, the presence of *a* with the latter may be explained as due to attraction:

Minaya a doña Ximena e a sus fijas que ha,
 e a las otras dueñas . . .
 el bueno de Minaya pensólas de adobar
 de los mejores guarnimientos 1424-27
 a Minaya e a las dueñas Dios cómo las ondrava' 1554
 a mio Cid e a los sos abátales de pan e de vino 66
 A la madre e a las fijas bien las abraçava 1661
 afevos todos aquestos reñiben a Minaya
 e a las dueñas e a las niñas e a las otras compañías 168-9

But it is not really necessary to have recourse to this explanation, for it is quite possible to find the preposition used with plural object—so long as the verb itself, or the general context, is such as to suggest an attitude of personal concern on the part of the subject: 7

a las sues fijas en braço' las prendia 275
 El rey a los infantes a las manos les tomó 2121

service of someone'). In the O. Sp. example just cited, however (and even more clearly in *Qui a buen señor sirve*, 850) the meaning is that of the transitive French Verb; moreover, *servir* in the *Cid* regularly takes the direct object of the pronoun: *A mis fijas sirvades . . . si bien las servides* . . . 2591-2.

7 Thus, while the simple accusative is usually reserved for a plural object, the prepositional accusative may serve for both singular and plural object, depending on the context (a 'group' need not be a 'mass'). In the Gascon dialects the rules determining usage are more rigid: according to Rohlf's (*Le Gascon*, 1935, § 415) the preposition is unknown with plural object.

A mis fijas sirvades, que vuestras, mugieres son,
si bien las servides, yo vos rendré buen galardón 2581-2

Valas conortando e metiendo coraçón
fata que esfuerçan . . .
con el so manto a amas las cubrió 2804-7

E él a las niñas tornólas a catar.
"a Dios vos acomiendo e al Padre spirital,
agora nos partimos, Dios sabe el ajunter." 371-73

Dios salve a nuestros amigos e a vos más, señor 3039

In the two groups of examples just above there is clearly present a ceremonious nuance—a nuance which may also be sensed with many of the preceding examples.⁸ But even in such cases as *matar a Búcar*, *enbair a Mio Cid* where the implication is hostile, there is none the less a recognition of the individuality of the object: we cannot overlook the significance of the fact that a proper name never shared the common construction of 'things,' but needed always to be introduced by the 'titular' *a*.

With all this we are reminded of Professor Spitzer's theory of the personal sphere. The main drawback to this theory, as elaborated by him, lies in the fact that it is made to do duty as an inter-

⁸ As an illustration of a similar connotation cf. Port. *homem temente a Deus* cited by Dunn in his Portuguese Grammar (London, 1930), p. 461. Again we may note the following example taken from a thirteenth century dialectical Italian vulgarization of Cato (Pei, *The Italian Language*, 1941, p. 193), where the prepositional construction is reserved for reference to God alone. *Adonca adora a Domenideu, amo to pare e toa mare, amora li toi parenti . . . temi to maestro. . . .* (In Old French, which did not know this prepositional development, a comparable connotation attended the use of *son cors* as a more personal and ceremonious designation of the person; cf. my article "*Son Cors* in O. F.," "*Corona*," Duke Univ. Press, 1941, p. 63-88.)

Keniston, *op. cit.*, p. 7, suggests the following explanation of the origin of *a* as personal accusative: According to him the use of *a* arose with pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons in the case of atonic *me*, *te* no distinction was made between dative and accusative; consequently, the form of the dative tonic pronoun (*a mí*, *a tí* [*da algo*]) was extended to the accusative: *a mí*, *a tí* (*recibe*). Finally this form spread to all pronouns and to substantives.

Apart from the matter of his questionable assumption of a purely mechanical analogical process (the aim of which would be, not that of establishing but of obliterating distinctions), it may be observed that the type *a mí*, *a tí* which he accepts as basic is only very seldom to be found in the *Cid*.

pretation of two distinct phenomena in as many languages; though the concept in question may indeed be underlying all these phenomena to some extent, it manifests itself quite differently in each case. If, however, his interpretation be limited to Spanish alone and modified to exclude the necessity of a hostile nuance (a nuance which depends upon the particular preposition, not upon prepositional usage in general), then the idea of the 'sphere' becomes graspable: it is illuminated by Spanish usage more clearly than by that of Rumanian. And, with this modification of his theory, there is perhaps resolved a very interesting paradox that is apparent in his discussion: at one point he states that the (international) prepositional construction implies a "*respect* for the sphere of another"; such an implication, while at variance with the special origin which he assumed for this construction in general, does, after all, hold true throughout for the phenomenon in Old Spanish.

As for the Latin-Spanish texts of the tenth century on which he based his assumption of the origin of the prepositional construction with verbs of violence, it must be admitted that, almost without exception, the examples cited by Cuervo conform to the type, *Et si unus ad alium cum pugno percuserit*.⁹ One must remember, however, that these examples come from legal documents, which, because of their specialized nature, should be analyzed separately. That, in such texts, references to violence predominate, is only to be expected; that, in such references, *ad* was used, may simply illustrate an emphasis, not upon hostility but upon *relationship*: the relationship between 'the party of the first part' and 'the party of the second part' (the regular pattern, as Professor Spitzer notes, is that of *unus . . . ad alium*). Here, in accordance with the nature of the texts, the connotation of *ad* is exploited in a technical rather than an emotional sense; basically, however, it is the same connotation as that found in the *Cid*. in both, 'regard' and 'concern' of a sort are involved—even if, in the Latin examples, there is as little of a truly subjective nuance¹⁰ as may be found in

⁹ Cf. however *In ista Era Ol. levavit Episcubo Domino Cresconio ad illo Infante Domine Garcia ad Galicia*; this offers a parallel to the many examples of *a* in the *Cid*.

¹⁰ If it be assumed that, by the tenth century, *ad* had already come to suggest a nuance of personal concern, then these legal texts must be taken to represent a 'depersonalization' of the nuance. It is quite possible, however, that the preposition had not at this time reached the stage

such phrases as *in regard to*, *as concerns*. Indeed, these phrases may be accepted as a fair, if slightly cumbersome, translation of the preposition in both types of texts.¹¹

The problem arises: how is such a construction as 'in regard to the Cid, the Moors watched' (*a mio Cid aguardavan moros*) to be explained? Surely not by interpreting the verb as an intransitive: if that were the case it would be impossible to find a *a mio Cid lo aguardavan*. And it is just such a combination of noun and pronoun which is the most frequent construction in the *Cid*—and which perhaps contains the explanation of the construction questioned above: 'in regard to the Cid, they watched *him*.' This may well have been the earlier form; later, the atonic pronoun, being the less emphatic and the less specific of the two elements of the combination, was omitted—an omission involving no ambiguity whatsoever, representing the procedure sometimes taking place in language whereby elements which have become superfluous are sloughed off.¹² What was retained, to become eventually the normal (if not

illustrated in the *Cid*; the first step in its development must have involved simply the extension of its reference to a relationship purely spatial to include that of general relationship ('dans la direction de' > 'à l'égard de'); later, the emphasis on relationship led to the acceptance of *ad* as a token of recognition and respect

But the first stage, as illustrated in the legal texts, is also to be met with in the *Cid*, in the following example we see again the pattern *unus ad alium*: *Los de mio Cid a los de Búcar de las tiendas los sacan*. The use of *a* with such a verb as *sacar* (and with plural object) is unusual; there can be little of a subjective nuance present: *ad* is exploited rather for its practical value. Thus is to be explained, in other Romance languages and dialects (which have developed the prepositional accusative to a greater or lesser extent), the prevalence of *a* in cases where loose sentence structure makes particularly desirable a device emphasizing relationship; Professor Spitzer cites (p. 429) O. Port. *vos mate ou vos a mim*, Béarnais *l'aimarè mès qu'à vous*; it was under the influence of this dialect that sixteenth century French writers introduced such constructions as *me remerciaient bien fort et à toute la compagnie*; *les bêtes nous flattent, nous requièrent, et non nous à elles*. In Modern Portuguese *a* is required to express the reciprocal relationship 'l'un l'autre' (*um ao outro*).

¹¹ For examples of *ad* = 'as concerns,' cf. *ThLL* s. v. *ad*. Cic. *ad ea . . . quae scribis . . . videbis*. This development originated in the frequent use in Classical Latin of *ad* in *refert ad*, *pertinet ad* etc.; traces of this development may be seen in such a Romance phrase as *quant à* (< *quantum ad illud* [*refert*]).

¹² The evidence of the Latin-Spanish examples would seem to contradict

the exclusive) designation of a personal accusative in Spanish, was the 'ceremonious,' 'individualistic' prepositional object. That, due to extension, standardization, the affective content of this construction has become diluted cannot be denied; but that something of it yet remains is sure.¹³

ANNA G. HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

UN ÉCHO DE GUINICELLI DANS PHILIPPE DESPORTES

Les poètes italiens qu'on a reconnus jusqu'ici comme ayant fourni des modèles aux poésies de Desportes sont tous, après le chantre de Laure, des pétrarquistes et des satiriques du quinzième ou du seizième siècle. Il est fort douteux que le poète chartrain ait connu Dante, et on n'a encore relevé aucune trace d'influence de l'école du *dolce stil novo* ni sur lui ni sur ses contemporains. Les poètes de la Pléiade et leurs disciples, malgré quelques poésies de goût néoplatonique, s'intéressaient en particulier à l'amour terrestre, simple et . . . récompensé. Ils étaient peu enclins à l'idéaliser ou à en faire l'apanage exclusif des âmes bien nées. Desportes ne fait pas exception et l'on sait combien, pour ce poète courtisan, "le plaisir consiste en chose qui s'éprouve" et quelle est sa complaisance même pour les plus raffinées sophistications voluptueuses de son efféminé maître royal.

Ce n'est donc pas sans un certain étonnement qu'on voit Desportes, dans une de ses élégies, raisonner sur l'amour en termes qui rappellent ceux des poètes italiens du *dolce stil novo*, qui avaient

the assumption that the combination of substantive and pronoun represented the original construction: as early as the tenth century the pronoun is regularly absent. But it is not necessary to assume that these texts, early as they are, illustrate the original construction; it may have already become possible to omit the pronoun—and in what context could such an omission be easier than in one involving an indefinite object?

¹³ According to Cuervo *a* is to be found before collective nouns only if the action is one which normally is directed upon an *individual*; he contrasts *entretener al publico* with *embarcar la gente*.

affirmé l'identité de l'amour avec la noblesse d'âme. L'élégie VII (p. 250 de l'édition Michiels) débute ainsi :

Comme dedans un bois enrichy de feuillage,
D'herbes, d'eaux et de fleurs, et tout couvert d'ombrage,
Se branchent les oyseaux esmaillez de couleurs,
Soupirans doucement leurs plaisantes douleurs;
Comme on voit dans un pré les fleurettes nouvelles
Monstrer comme à l'envy leurs beautez naturelles,
Ainsi dedans un cœur hautain et genereux
Se retirent tousjours les desirs amoureux,
Les douces passions, les delectables peines,
Et les cheres langueurs dont les amours sont pleines,
Qui ne doivent jamais un amant retenir,
Veu qu'un grand bien ne peut sans travail s'obtenir.

Un cœur noble et gentil sans amour ne peut estre,
Car avecques l'Amour Nature l'a fait naistre,
Les a liés ensemble et les joint tellement,
Qu'ils demeurent tousjours inseparablement,
Comme le beau soleil et sa lumiere claire,
Comme l'ombre effroyable et la nuict solitaire . . .
Bref, quiconque est bien né sent tousjours dedans l'ame
L'inévitable effort de l'amoureuse flame,
Qui ne reçoit jamais de refroidissement
Car la parfaite amour dure éternellement .
Et voilà ce qui fait que l'Amour que je porte
A vos beautez, madame, a la trempe si forte . . . [!]

On dirait une adaptation, bien diluée, du commencement de la célèbre canzone de Guido Guinicelli :

Al cor gentil ripara sempre Amore
com'a la selva augello in la verdura;
né fe' Amore anti che gentil core,
né gentil core anti ch'Amor natura,
ch'adesso com fu il sole,
sí tosto lo splendore fu lucente
né fu davanti il sole;
e prendere Amore in gentilezza loco
cosí propiamente
come calore in clarità di foco . . .

Même image, même comparaison avec l'oiseau, même contemporanéité du noble cœur et de la nature, mêmes exemples tirés des phénomènes naturels, dans les deux poètes. L'imitation apparaît d'autant plus probable que Desportes, en reprenant cette idée dans

le dernier verset du *Combat de l'Amour*,¹ traduit presque littéralement les deux premiers vers de Guido :

Dedans un cœur gentil l'Amour toujours demeure,
Comme dedans un bois tout fleuri de verdure
Se branchent les oyseaux au printemps esmaillé;
Celluy qui n'aime point n'a pas l'ame bien faicte,
Grossier, pesant et lourd, de nature imparfaicte,
Et porte en l'estomach ung grand rocher taillé.

Le parallèle est si frappant qu'on se demande si Desportes n'avait pas devant lui le texte du poète bolonais. C'est fort probable, car on l'avait imprimé en 1527 dans un des recueils des Giunti, que Desportes aurait pu voir en Italie lorsqu'il y alla vers 1565. On connaît son faible pour les recueils de *rime* italiennes. Il ne faut pas exclure, cependant, la possibilité d'intermédiaires qu'on ignore. Pour Dante également,

Amor e 'l cor gentil sono una cosa,

et Poliziano avait fait écho, lui aussi, à Guinicelli, dans la *Giostra* :

E tu pur suoli al cor gentile, Amore,
Riparar, come augello alla verdura.

Mais ni Dante ni Poliziano n'ont pu servir de modèle à Desportes. La voie par laquelle cette conception italienne de l'amour parvint à la connaissance du poète français reste peut-être encore à éclaircir. Nous sommes toujours loin de connaître tous les petits poètes italiens qu'il avait pu lire. Du moins peut-on affirmer tout de suite que Desportes ne comprit point la délicate noblesse du passage italien. Il en adopte l'expression originale, mais il n'a que faire du vrai sens de ces vers, qu'il utilise simplement comme ornement poétique ou (dans l'élégie) comme un argument pour persuader une dame, dont il a été séparé par un vulgaire hasard de politique, de la constance de son amour. Les deux imitations concordent assez mal avec leurs contextes, et le poète retombe immédiatement dans ses habituelles jolieses de pétrarquiste. Il n'en est pas moins intéressant de relever dans un poète de la Renaissance française l'influence, directe ou indirecte, du *stil novo* ; on n'en connaît pas d'autres exemples.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

¹ Que M. Lavaud vient de publier pour la première fois dans son édition des *Imitations de l'Arioste par Philippe Desportes suivies de poésies inédites*, Paris, Droz, 1936, p. 133.

THE FORMATION OF OLD HIGH GERMAN *diorna*,
 OLD SAXON *thiorna*, GOTHIC *widuwarna*, AND
 OLD ENGLISH *níwerne*

Brugmann lists Gothic *widuwarna* 'Verwaister' and Old High German *diorna* 'Dienerin, Mädchen,' Old Norse *þerna* under the *rno*-formations,¹ in which the *no*-formation would have been added to the *r*-stems. Kluge² (-Gotze)³ and Feist⁴ give explanations along the same line.

While such an explanation has the appearance of being correct, it apparently is not possible to give any specific *r*-stem as a model. One might then ask whether the *r(n)* formation in *diorna* and *widuwarna* is not taken over from another word (or wordgroup). To find an explanation one would look first for a word with the meaning household, family or kinship.

The Old English word *níwerne* 'young, tender (child)'⁵ may point the way to a solution. *Níwerne* is a new formation on models like *fæderen* 'paternal,' *fæderenbróðor* 'brother,' *fæd(e)rencnósl* 'father's kin,' *fæderencynn* 'father's kin,' *fæderenhealf* 'father's side,' *fæderenmæg* 'paternal kinsman,' *fæderenmægð*, or *médren*, *médern* 'maternal, on the mother's side,' *médrencynn*, *médrengecynd*, *médrenmæg*, *médrenmægð*, *rihtmédrencynn*, or *gesweosternu bearn*.

One may assume that, in a similar way, *diorna* and *widuwarna* obtained the *r-n*-formation from this wordgroup designating kinship and family, or rather, directly or indirectly, from the word *fadrin*-, which can be explained on the basis of an Idgc. word. This word is **pətr(i)jo-*: Greek *πάτριος*, Latin *patrius*, Skr. *pítrya*-, an (*i*)*jo*- derivation from **pətōr*. An *n*-derivation from an *io*-stem is Old Norse *Herian(n)*,⁶ a name of Odin. In composition we find *hari-gasti*, *hari-wulafa*, and Keltic-Germanic *C(h)ario-viscus*, *Hario-baudes*, *Chario-merus*.

¹ Grdr. II, 1², § 193 (1906)

² *Nominale Stammbildungslehre der Altgermanischen Dialekte*², 53: "ahd. *diorna*- andd. *thiorna*- and. *þerna* erinnert an das mask. got. *widuwarna* und an ags. *áeweorna* eichhörnchen."

³ Kluge-Gotze, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* under *Dirne*.

⁴ Feist, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache* under *widuwarna*.

⁵ sum wif mid hire nýwerenan (níwernan) cilde, Ælfric, *Hom.*, I, 566, 5.

⁶ Compare also the proper name *Oriono-totae*.

One would then expect in Gothic a **fadrin-*⁷ (which might be a later derivation). If there appears in Gothic a **fadrin-* (*fadreinus* g. 'Abkunft, Geschlecht,' *fadrema* n. pl. 'Eltern, Grosseltern, Vorfahren,' and *fadreinais* g. sg. 'Geschlecht') with a long *i* (which form seems to have a parallel in Old Swedish *faþrine* 'vaterliche Seite' and *moþrine* 'mütterliche Seite'⁸), one would prefer to dissent from the usual statement that Gothic *-ein-* corresponds to Idgc. *-in-*; as *fadrein-* is linked up with Idgc. **pətr(i)jo-*, one would rather connect this mutation *io: i: i* with similar phenomena: Gothic *gabeigs* with long *i* instead of short *i*, which is preserved in *gabigs*, or OHG. *truhtin* beside Gothic *druhti-nassus*, or Gothic *harjis* instead of **haris*. And here is one source of this mutation: the Germanic *ja*-declension comprises also *i*-stems (nom. *-is*⁹), for which the ending *-eis* in Gothic is correct. Gothic *widuwarnna* is linked up with Gothic *widuwo* 'widow'¹⁰ (: Skt. *vidhāvā*, Av. *viðū-*, *viðavā*). If one presupposes a derivation in analogy to **fadrin-*, one would obtain a **widuwrin-* > *widūrīn-*; however, metathesis took place (**widuwrin-* > *widuwarnn-*) in adaptation to *widuwo*.

Old High German *diorna* is to be explained in a similar way. It is derived from *þiwa-* by an element *r(i)n*, the rise of which was traced back to *fadrin-*. It may be mentioned that there exist some additional formations in Icelandic: *bróðerni* 'brotherhood,' *ættarni* 'family, descent, extraction,' *frænderni* 'kinship,' *þjóðerni* 'nationality,' *sonerni* 'state of being a son,' *lífarni* 'life, conduct.'¹¹

In the same way there was created in Old English *cynren*¹² 'kindred, family, generation, posterity, stock, kind, species,' *forecynren* 'progeny.'

Fritz Meizer

Bryn Mawr College

⁷ The Old English forms and most of the Scandinavian forms may have short *i*.

⁸ See Noreen, *Altschwedische Grammatik*, § 396.

⁹ *haurdeis* is such an *i*-stem besides an *ō*-stem **kērdhos*: Skt. *śarāhas* 'Herde, Schar.' Compare Skt. *rathī-h* 'Wagenlenker': *ratha-* 'Wagen.' See J. Lohmann, *Genus und Sexus*, p. 67 ff.

¹⁰ *widuwo* may originally have been an adjective (like **fadrin-*); this would explain the *n*-derivation from the old *ā*-stem (a formation, which is characteristic for feminine adjectives; see Lohmann, p. 22 ff.).

¹¹ Innleiðing til gamalnorsk Ordbok; Gamalnorsk orðafleiðing ved Alf Torp.

¹² *Arch. f. d. St. d. N. Sp.* 161, 228.

THE QUARREL BETWEEN FINN AND OISIN

A number of years ago, the late Professor Kuno Meyer in his *Fianaigeacht*¹ published a poem which he entitled "The Quarrel between Finn and Oisín." This poem, consisting as it does of a "fliting" between the great leader of the Fiana and his son Oisín, who at first did not recognize his father, is preserved in three MSS., all of which were written in the sixteenth century. Yet, as Meyer justly observed, the text itself must have been composed during the Old Irish period, perhaps even as early as the eighth century, because it contains a series of linguistic forms which it would be difficult to attribute to a later date. Unfortunately, however, the verses are badly transmitted and contain many corruptions. To Meyer, therefore, belongs great credit for having achieved such a successful translation despite the handicaps under which he was laboring, though he himself refers modestly to it as "tentative and imperfect."

Since the publication of his translation, little has been done to solve the problems presented by this poem. In a review of his own work, Meyer, to be sure, pointed out two corrections,² and in another publication he also suggested an emendation.³ But the only other contribution known to me was made orally by the late Professor Rudolf Thurneysen who once proposed that the obscure phrase *ro·daim do bath* in the fourth quatrain should be translated "he [Finn] can endure to death," where the *ro* in *ro daim* has exactly the same potential force that it possesses in the preceding verbs, namely *ro·goim* and *ro·gonar*.

These suggestions, welcome as they are, do not, however, solve by any means all the difficulties in the poem. Among the many

¹ Cf. p. 22 f.

² See *Zeitschr. f. celt. Philol.*, VIII, 599.

³ See *Revue Celtique*, XXXIII, 98. If *berte in n-urain n-ellaig* is there correctly rendered by "who carry the vanguard of the battle," then *rem-maig* which rhymes with the preceding *n-ellaig* may be corrupt for *reb-maig*. Hence, *rethit fuili for reb-maig* in the fourth verse of the quatrain may mean: "Streams of blood run upon the plain of feats," where by "the plain of feats" the battlefield is, of course, intended. The interchange of aspirated *b* and *m* is common enough and may have been here furthered by the fact that the scribes mistook *reb* for *rém(m)*, "a course," which often occurs as the first or second element of compounds.

problems still requiring solution is the meaning of the last two verses in the third stanza. As printed by Meyer,⁴ the text at present reads:

*Is glé cid tressa a rig
Ocus cid lethra a bil,
Nicon cumaing ar asnu
Arumfosta i cridnu*

This he translates:

'Tis clear, though his wrist⁵ is stronger
And though the rim of his shield is broader,
He cannot . . .

From the foregoing quatrains in which father and son have each, in turn, been vaunting their prowess at the expense of the other, it is clear that Oisín, who is here speaking, though he is willing to admit Finn's superiority in certain respects, nevertheless believes that he himself will prevail. Hence, the third verse should signify that Finn cannot overcome him, whereas the fourth verse ought to furnish the reason for that belief. On the basis of this premiss, the resolution of the last verse would seem to lie in regarding *arumfosta* as composed of three distinct and separate words which are: (1) the conjunction *ar*, "for"; (2) the present indicative first singular of the copula *am*, "I am," badly written *um* in MSS. H and M, but more correctly *im* in MS. N;⁶ and (3) the comparative of the adjective *fossad*, "firm, steadfast," namely *fostu*, the older spelling with final *u* for later *a* being actually preserved in MS. N. Hence, *ar am⁷ fostu i cridnu* apparently means: "For I [Oisín] am firmer in heart."⁸ That, at all events, supplies a reasonable answer to

⁴ Cf. *Fianagecht*, p. 24.

⁵ Rather "(lower) arm."

⁶ *Im* is a frequent spelling after the conjunction *ar* in Old Irish; cf. R. Thurneysen, *Handbuch des Alt-Irischen*, p. 434, § 772.

⁷ Or *im*, as in MS. N.

⁸ Instances of *fossad* used in collocation with *crude* are unknown to me, but the derivative *cobsaíd* (earlier *cobsuđ*) is so employed; cf. G. Keating, *The Three Shafts of Death*, ed. O. Bergin, p. 259. If Meyer is right, the *i* after *fostu* is the preposition signifying "in." But all the MSS. read *a*, and the only example of *i* at present recorded occurs in the phrase *fosta i n-árus*; cf. K. Meyer, *The Triads of Ireland*, p. 26, § 218. Here, however, *fosta* is not the adjective, but the corresponding noun. Furthermore, as Professor Myles Dillon has suggested, one normally would expect a de-

the question why Finn cannot get the better of Oisín; for Finn may be stronger and may possess a broader shield, but Oisín, being the younger of the two, has naturally a better heart and so can outlast his aged opponent.

As has already been suggested, the third verse ought to signify that Finn is unable to overcome Oisín. If that is true, *ar* may here be the well-known word meaning "slaughter" or "defeat" so that *nícon·cumaing*⁹ *ār* might be translated: "He [Finn] cannot slay [me]." At the end of the third verse, however, the Irish poets are fond of inserting a parenthetical phrase or remark, technically known as a *cheville*, which often has little connection with what precedes or follows. Now, *asnu* would seem to be just such a *cheville*. For if *as·nū* is read, the resulting form might well be the present indicative first singular of *as·noí*, "vows, swears,"¹⁰ which is here added principally in order to supply the two missing syllables of the heptasyllabic line, though in this instance the meaning "I vow" actually suits the context much better than that of many other parallel cases, where *chevilles* occur.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, therefore, the last two verses of this quatrain should probably be emended and translated as follows:

Nícon·cumaing ār,- as·nū -
*Ar am*¹¹ *fostu i crídiu.*
 "He cannot slay [me],- I vow -
 For I am firmer in heart."¹²

VERNAM HULL

New York University

pendent genitive rather than a preposition after the adjective, as in: *etrom cuirp ba trom fedma*; cf. Maude Joynt, *Tromdámh Guaire*, p. 8. The prepositional construction, therefore, requires further support. At all events, *a* can hardly be the preposition meaning "from," nor is it likely that *a c[h]rídiu* signifies " (than) his heart," where *a* would then be the possessive pronoun referring to Finn.

⁹ For *cumaing*, MSS. H and N both read *cumang*.

¹⁰ For this verb, see *HIL.* II, 142 s. v. (*as*-)*noí*.

¹¹ Or *im*, as in MS N.

¹² In the ninth quatrain, for *topur thulí* recalls the parallel phrase *ina thopor thulí* in *The Mesca Ulad* (ed. W. M. Hennessy), p. 8.

"DAN CHAUCER"

The poet Spenser, in what is probably the most widely known of all Chaucer allusions, refers to his most distinguished predecessor as "Dan Chaucer, well of English vndefyled" (*Faerie Queene*, iv, ii, 32). "Dan Chaucer," in its prefixing of title to surname, is the equivalent of "Sir Raleigh" (instead of "Sir Walter");¹ in fact, *dominus*, whence *dan* is ultimately derived,² was sometimes rendered by *sir* and used, "with the surname of the person, to designate a Bachelor of Arts in some Universities" (*NED*, s. v. *sir*).³ Unless Spenser had this university practice specifically in mind,⁴ and was thinking of Chaucer as a learned "clerk," perhaps even as a university man, it is difficult to see why he did not here write "Dan Geoffrey," since the meter would in no way have been affected, unless he wanted to make doubly sure that the reader would make the proper identification; indeed, later in the poem he does use what

¹ R. W. Chapman refers to "Sir Richmond" (for "Sir William [Richmond] ") as a continental error (*Names, Designations and Appellations*, S. P. E. Tract XLVII, Oxford, 1936, p. 252). He might with perfect justice have written "continental and American." Dr. Oliver St. John Gogarty reports a conversation between an American millionaire and Sir Horace Plunkett in which the American addresses Sir Horace as "Sir Plunkett" (*As I Was Going Down Sackville Street*, New York, 1937, p. 118). There must be many such examples of American ineptitude in the use of English titles.

² Despite the apparent belief of a sadly muddled gentleman who wrote to *Notes and Queries* (May 30, 1863, pp. 427-8) to inquire as to the origin of *dan*, remarking that "to modern ears it has an air of grotesque familiarity, derived perhaps from 'Old Dan Tucker' and other Yankee associations." His selection of "Daniel" as a *nom de guerre* would seem to furnish a key to his confusion.

³ Says Nares (*Gloss.*, ed 1859, s v *sir*), "*Dominus*, the academical title of a bachelor of arts, was usually rendered by *sir* in English, at the Universities, so that a bachelor, who in the books stood *Dominus* Brown, was in conversation called *Sir* Brown," adding that "this was in use in some colleges even in my memory." (He died in 1829, in his seventy-sixth year.) He points out, however, that, except for this archaic university custom, "*sir* is prefixed to the Christian name," explaining that "sirnames [*sic*] were little used, when the practice began."

⁴ "This seems most unlikely, inasmuch as only the English *sir* or the Latin *dominus* were so used, not the derivative *dan*; nor is the at present familiar Oxford and Cambridge *don* used as a title of rank prefixed to a name.

would seem to be the more orthodox form, i. e., "Dan Geffrey" (vii, vii, 9). In both cases, however, identification is equally certain because of references to works of Chaucer. It seems most likely that Spenser was using the title *dan*, already old-fashioned, to connote antiquity, dignity, learning, and respectful affection for his avowed literary idol, and that the usage which we should expect to find (by analogy with earlier non-academic⁵ and with present-day *sir*, as well as with earlier *dan*) was not fixed in his day.⁶ There can be absolutely no question, however, that prefixing *dan* to the surname was at any period exceedingly rare.⁷

It is worthy of note that Chaucer himself uses the title *dan*, or *dawn*, like *sir*, in the more usual fashion, i. e., with given names, e. g., Albon, Burnel, Gerveys, John, Piers, Russell, Thomas, though, when he prefixes it, sometimes facetiously, I suspect, but quite in accord with tradition, to classical and biblical names, he of course uses either the single name by which the character was generally known or the only name borne by the character, e. g., Antenor, Arcite, Claudian, Constantyn, Cupido, Eneas, Eolus, Ethiocles, Jupiter, Lucan, Phraao, Phebus, Plato, Polymytes, Pseustis, Ptholome, Rupheo, Salomon, Scipio.

J. M. Manly, in his edition of the *Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928), says of Chaucer's *dan*, or *dawn*: "It is, apparently, not used with family names, but only with given names. Tennyson therefore in 'The Dream of Fair Women' should have said 'Dan Geoffrey,' not 'Dan Chaucer'" (p. 546). Of course, Tennyson's "Dan Chaucer" is only a reflection of Spenser's more famous usage, as are probably all references to "Dan Chaucer" subsequent to Spenser—and there are many, the misnomer (as it almost certainly is) having acquired an affectionate, reverent, and sometimes even a jocular connotation.⁸

⁵ Used "rarely" before the surname, according to *NED*, which labels such use obsolete.

⁶ Except for "Dan Chaucer" and "Dan Geffrey," Spenser applies the title only to figures from classical story and myth: Aeolus, Cupid, Faunus, Jove, Orpheus, Perseus, Phoebus. With none of these is there any question of choice between two names.

⁷ The cognate *don* and *dom* in Spanish and Portuguese always precede the Christian name.

⁸ Washington Irving, "To Lancelot Langstaff, Esq." in *Salmagundi*, Feb. 1807 (*Works*, ed. 1880-3, xvi, 68), refers to "Dan Spenser" as well as to "Dan Chaucer," both of whom, "though covered with dust, are yet true sterling gold."

Spenser was not, however, the first to refer to the older poet as "Dan Chaucer." Caroline F. E. Spurgeon cites two earlier uses,⁹ both in MSS. written around the middle of the 15th century, which may possibly have been known to Spenser. The readings of both MSS. are the same except for the spelling of one word, and the sentence, because of its stereotyped nature, was probably of frequent occurrence, with change of title according to the poem, as a head line or an end line in texts of Chaucer's poems: "Explicit Pyte dan Chaucer lauture."¹⁰ Except for these two references to "Dan Chaucer," the only other widely known example of *dan* prefixed to a surname antecedent to Spenser's usage is "Dan Lidgate" in "William Baldwin to the Reader," prefaced to the *Mirror for Magistrates*.¹¹

There can be little doubt, then, not only that all subsequent "Dan Chaucers" are simply reflections of Spenser's usage, as has been stated above, but also that all subsequent uses of *dan* with surname stem from his famous "blunder" (if it may be so called). In the 18th century, *dan*, though quite obsolete, was apparently well known, thanks to Spenser, and was bestowed by the poets upon their fellows in facetious and somewhat affected manner. Thus, Prior refers to "Dan Pope" ("Alma," II, 120), and Pope in turn refers to "our friend, Dan Prior" (*Imitations of Horace*, Bk. II, Sat. VI, line 153). The final stanza of the "*Bouts Rimés* on Signora Domitilla," attributed to Swift and usually included among his poems, also contains a reference to "Dan Pope."

In any event, it seems certain that Spenser's use of the title, unorthodox though it may be, has established for "Dan Chaucer" a position of affectionate regard in the hierarchy of "dans" second only to that held by "Dan Cupid." Surely Dan Chaucer (for the writer is quite willing to do his bit in perpetuating so worthy a solecism) would have desired no more exalted station.

THOMAS PYLES

University of Maryland

⁹ *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* (Cambridge, 1925), I, 45 and 50.

¹⁰ The second instance cited by Miss Spurgeon has "Laucaire" for "lauture," but both forms obviously stand for *l'autour*.

¹¹ Ed. L. B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), p. 69.

THE PRIORESS'S GEMS

Three gems, the ruby, the emerald, and the pearl, are used in the *Prioress's Tale*, each in a symbolic sense. The first two are definitely named, and the pearl is the generally accepted explanation of the "greyn."¹ The ruby and the emerald, because of at least two popular associations, are especially appropriate because, even to the layreader of the Middle Ages, they suggested the two principal aspects of the *Prioress's Tale*: the martyrdom of the "litel clergeon" and the miraculous intervention of the Virgin Mary.

The assignment of precious and semi-precious stones to the various months is ancient, as is also the belief that certain qualities ascribed to the various gems passed to the wearer. The emerald, assigned to the month of May, which is still regarded as the month of Mary by the Catholic Church, would be particularly close to the Virgin. The stone was believed to have the power to preserve the chastity of its wearer. The Prioress must have been quite aware of this for she says, "This gemme of chastite, this emeraude. . . ."² Chastity, the virtue most praised in the "mooder Mayde" during the Middle Ages, was likewise the virtue which would most appeal to Chaucer's Prioress as a professed nun. In addition, the emerald was supposed to be an especial protection in childbirth. Thus, in the one gem, are symbolized the maternity and the chastity of the Virgin, which are emphasized by repetition in the *Prioress's Prologue*, the perfect union of which qualities would immediately suggest the Virgin Mary to the medieval mind.

The ruby was early assigned to the month of July, which in the church calendar is set for special devotion to the Precious Blood, and thus typifies the martyrdom of Christ in the crucifixion. The ruby from early times has been associated with blood, undoubtedly because of its color. Of this, too, the Prioress is aware when she says, "And eek of martirdom the ruby bright."³ A third association of the ruby will also present itself to the reader of the *Canterbury Tales*. It is not improbable that the ruby (L. *rubeus*), which was assigned to Mars, has connection with the geomantic figure of

¹ F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, B., 1852, n.; NED., "Grain," II, and "Ruby," 12.

² B., 1799.

³ B., 1800.

the same name mentioned in the *Knight's Tale*, which also was associated with Mars.⁴

The pearl, the third of the Prioress's gems, had long been thought of as symbolic of the Virgin,⁵ perhaps because of its whiteness, which represented the spotlessness of Mary, and because of its different origin, that is, animal rather than the usual mineral, thereby recalling the doctrine that she alone was born without having the stain of Adam and Eve's guilt on her soul.

The combination of the qualities represented by the three gems, or, in terms, of color, red, green, and white, is most closely knit in the longest digression which the Prioress makes:

O martir, sowded to virginitte,
Now maystow syngen, folwyng evere in oon,
The white Lamb celestial,

which brings together martyrdom, virginity, and heavenly perfection, all of which must have appealed strongly to the Prioress.

JAMES J. LYNCH

Arizona State Teachers College

JOHN PAYNE COLLIER AND *THE MURDER OF IOHN BREWEN*

Among the works attributed to Thomas Kyd is a pamphlet of 1592 disclosing "The Trueth of the most wicked and secret Murthuring of Iohn Brewen, committed by his owne wife, through the prouocation of one Iohn Parker. . . ." After mentioning that Kyd enjoyed reasonable social security from 1590 to 1593, F. S. Boas, Kyd's editor, comments on the authorship of the pamphlet:

whoever Kyd's 'lord' may have been, the fact of his holding a fixed appointment in his service makes his authorship of *The Murder of Iohn Brewen* even more singular than it seemed before. It was plausibly conjectured that this sensational tract had been dashed off at a time when the dramatist was in sore need of money. But on June 28, 1592, the date of John Parker and Anne Brewen's execution for the murder, and also of the licensing of the tract to the stationer, John Kid (cf. Arber's *Transcript*, ii, 289b), its

⁴ A, 2045.

⁵ See Robinson, p. 841.

author had held for about two years a position where he was no longer merely a 'shifting companion,' dependent on literary hackwork for a livelihood.

Boas finds in the tract "traces of Kyd's mannerisms," but there seems to be little in the style of the *Murder* to indicate that the dramatist wrote it. "Yet," says Boas, "its genuineness cannot be questioned. In the unique copy at Lambeth Kyd's name is written, in a contemporary hand, at the foot of the title page and at the close. The signatures are, however, probably not his own, for they vary considerably from the autograph in the *Letter to Puckering*."¹ G. Sarrazin, a few years earlier, had called the writing of the tract the single certain fact of Kyd's biography.² A. F. Hopkinson, in 1913, not only prints the tract as Kyd's but cites parallels from it and *Arden of Feversham* as evidence that Kyd wrote the play.³

Since the pyramid of inferences balanced on the authority of those two signatures continues to grow in bulk, it is interesting to notice that John Payne Collier, unfortunately better known for his forgeries than for his genuine contributions to Elizabethan scholarship, first called attention to the Lambeth copy, assigning it to Kyd. And it is also interesting that Collier's personal copy of his 1863 reprint of the unique quarto⁴ has signatures like those of the Lambeth copy glued on it. In Collier's copy, now in the Henry E. Huntington Library, "Ihō Kyde," the name of the publisher, has been written in brown ink on a small slip of thin paper and stuck with bits of wax to the title page; "Tho. Kydde," in what seems to be a different hand but in the same ink and on thin paper, is fastened in the same way at the end of the tract. I have been unable to compare the signatures on the Huntington copy of the reprint with the original writing at Lambeth. Comparison with

¹ See F. S. Boas, *Works of Thomas Kyd* (London, 1901), pp. lxiv-lxv.

² *Englische Studien*, xv (1891), 260.

³ A. F. Hopkinson, *Play Sources* (London, 1913), pp. vi-vii. It is curious that both Hopkinson and Boas, although basing their cases almost entirely on the signatures, have erred in reading them and have failed to point out that the signatures appear to be in different hands. The title-page signature is surely "Ihō Kyde" and not "Thō Kyde," as they report it; and the final signature in a different hand is "Tho. Kydde" and not "Tho. Kydd." Cf. W. W. Greg, *English Literary Autographs* (Oxford, 1925), Part I, No. xv.

⁴ *Illustrations of Early English Popular Literature*, ed. J. Payne Collier (London, 1863), I, tract 2.

W. W. Greg's facsimile reproductions,⁵ however, shows that the signatures were certainly intended to look alike.

It is necessary to resist the temptation to brand everything that passed through Collier's hands a forgery, but the following circumstances seem worth consideration.

1. The Lambeth copy of the 1592 quarto was listed before Collier used it as an anonymous tract, in S. R. Mantland's 1845 catalogue of English Books in the Lambeth Palace Library.⁶ It is impossible to know how thoroughly the cataloguer examined the copy before listing it—the fact that he misspelled the name of the victim as "Brewer" rather than "Brewen" suggests that he was not too careful—but he names the printers and must have looked at the title page. At least Kyd's authorship does not seem to have been established at that time. While discussing Kyd in 1831, in his *History of Dramatic Poetry*, Collier made no mention of the tract.

2. It was Collier who announced that the pamphlet was Kyd's. In 1862, a year before he published his reprint, Collier commented in *Notes and Queries*:

We may doubt whether this tract was ever "allowed to be printed" and the only copy we have seen of it was that actually sent to the public authorities for approbation. It is a great curiosity in another respect, because on the title-page is written the name of the publisher John Kyd (so spelt) and at the end of it the name of Thomas Kydde (so spelt) the author—Thomas Kydde being no other than the distinguished dramatic poet and precursor of Shakespeare, the writer of *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Jeronimo*, *Cornelia*, and other theatrical productions. It is by inference that we suppose him to have been the author of the remarkable production under consideration. And that the publisher of it was his brother, or some near relation.⁷

In his introduction to his reprint of the next year he was less hesitant in suggesting that the dramatist and printer were brothers, and he published the Brewen tract as the work of Thomas Kyd.

3. Collier explained in the introduction to his reprint that

⁵ W. W. Greg, *op. cit.*, I, No. xv.

⁶ *An Index of such English Books, printed before the year MDC., as are now in the Archbishop's library at Lambeth* (London, 1845), p. 13. The tract is listed. "Brewer (John), The Truth of the most wicked and secret Murthering of, by his wife and John Parker, John Kid and Edw. White, 1592."

⁷ *Notes and Queries*, third series, I (1862), 241-42.

The copy of the tract employed for our reprint was clearly that transmitted to one of the licensers, near the close of the sixteenth century, for his approbation. no other exemplar is known. The name of John Kyd, the stationer, was written by him on the title-page and that of Thomas Kydde, the author, was subscribed at the end.

Collier had probably not seen a signature of Kyd—Sidney Lee apparently first pointed out Kyd's signed letter to Puckering in 1892 in his article in *DNB*—and it is strange that he did not guess first that the signatures were autographs, especially since they appear to have been written by different people. Since the hands differ, it is hardly likely that Collier forged the signatures with so implausible an explanation already prepared. If the Lambeth signatures are a forgery, it is more probable that the explanation in the 1863 preface was conceived after the names had been written on the old quarto. At any rate, Collier's conjecture is hard to understand, unless it is the result of whim or unless Collier was seeking a "safe" explanation. It would have been hard to compare the writing with that of the unknown licenser.

4. It is safe, I think, to assume that Collier wrote the signatures fastened to his copy of the reprint—other notes by Collier appear in the volume. I have compared them with Greg's facsimile of the writing on the Lambeth quarto. The two sets of signatures usually were formed with the same strokes, and nearly all Collier's letters correspond to those at Lambeth. But one or two rather obvious variations in the form of letters—especially differences in the final "e"s of the title-page names—show that Collier did not make careful reproductions of the Lambeth writing and fasten them in his own book. In other words, the similarities suggest that the same person might have written the two sets of signatures, while the variations show that Collier's set is not simply a tracing or careful copy made by the scholar for reference.

Since Kyd's authorship of the pamphlet has been established almost entirely on the authority of the signatures, in the face of evidence to the contrary, the circumstances mentioned above have some importance. Of course they do not prove that the signatures on the unique copy of 1592 are spurious. But they indicate that there were enough peculiarities in Collier's handling of the quarto to make the signatures less authoritative than they have seemed.

ROBERT MARK GORRELL

Deep Springs College, California

UNITY OF TIME IN *EVERY MAN IN HIS HUMOR* AND *CYNTHIA'S REVELS*

It is generally known that Jonson revised the Quarto versions of his early plays for his Folio *Works* of 1616. These revisions have received much comment in the textual studies of various scholars, notably in those of Professor Simpson in the Oxford edition of Jonson. One type of textual change, however, which involved either an addition or an emendation, has passed unnoticed. This type, with which this article deals, derives from Jonson's application of the unity of time.

Except for *The Case is Altered*, which represents his romantic period, and *Every Man out of his Humor*, Jonson's early comedies conform to the neoclassical rule of the unity of time. According to this rule, the duration of time is not supposed to exceed twelve hours. *A Tale of a Tub* and *Every Man in his Humor* abide by the rule strictly; throughout the course of action, the time is mentioned within the dialogue. *Every Man out of his Humor*, although its dialogue similarly indicates the passing of time, covers two and a half days and thus exceeds the time limit.¹ *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster* exhibit a freer treatment of this unity, because, as time is infrequently referred to in the dialogue, only an impression of a day passing from morning to night is given.

In the course of rewriting and revising earlier Quarto versions of his plays for the Folio *Works* of 1616, Jonson made two textual

¹ T. R. Lounsbury, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist* (New York, 1901), p. 30: "The time of this particular play is not clearly defined. It is apparently rather more than a day and a half; though things are performed in it which in real life would have occupied several days" Mable Buland, *The Presentation of Time in Elizabethan Drama*, Yale Studies in English, XLIV (New York, 1912), p. 146, states that the play requires a day and a half. Josef Gutmann, *Die Dramatischen Einheiten bei Ben Jonson* (Munich, 1913), p. 64, is perhaps correct: "Out erstreckt sich über 3 aufeinanderfolgende Tage, vom Mittwoch bis Freitag Abend." Herford and Simpson are not committed to any definite statement. Analysis proves that the play is composed of three parts: Day A: i, i-ii, iii, late afternoon or evening. Day B: ii, iv-iii, viii; morning, noon, and ?. Day C: iii, ix-v, xi; morning, noon, and night. As far as time is concerned, there is no difference between the two Holme editions of *Every Man out* (Quartos 1 and 2, 1600) and the Folio text. The Quarto (1602) of *Poetaster* is also consistent, in the matter of time, with the Folio.

alterations in the text of *Every Man in* that were concerned with time. The action of the play (Quarto 1601) takes place in one day, with a regularity almost mathematical, which the later text (Folio 1616) does not add to or take away from but for these two instances. How Jonson improved his application of the unity of time for the later text is shown in the following time-scheme of the Quarto.²

The first scene is early morning. "here's a goodly day toward" (I, i, 1), and Lorenzo, Jr. is "scarce stirring yet" (I, i, 28). Until Lorenzo, Jr. arises and reads the letter Prospero's messenger has brought, a half hour has passed: "It's almost halfe an houre ago since he rid hence" (I, ii, 22). It is six o'clock at Cob's house (I, iii, 50-51), and six-thirty in Bobadilla's room (I, iii, 112). Within Thorello's house "the bell rings to breakfast" (I, iv, 147). In the next act it is still morning, for Musco says Lorenzo, Sr. intends to follow his son to Florence "this morning" (II, i, 9). According to the plan in his friend's letter, Lorenzo, Jr. meets Prospero and complains that "my father had the proving of your copy some houre before I saw it" (II, iii, 43). *This is a slight inconsistency; for at I, ii, 22 it is a half-hour, while at II, iii, 43 it is an hour, before Lorenzo, Jr. sees the letter after his father has read it. Jonson cleared it up in the 1616 text by excluding the half-hour reference, in I, ii, 22 (1601), from I, iii, 22-25 (1616).*

Thorello has an appointment at Clement's; he asks Piso the time: "New stricken ten" (III, i, 2-3). And it is "Past ten" a few lines after (III, i, 36-37). For these exact time references the Folio has, instead, "Exchange time, sir" (1616, III, iii, 44). This alteration may have been made in the interest of vivid local color.

Thorello expects his business engagement to consume two hours, one for the trip, one for the business, "an hower to goe and come" and "An houre, before I can dispatch with him" (III, i, 7-9). When Cob is sent to Clement's house by Piso, probably an hour has gone by since III, i. In the next scene the morning may have passed, for Matheo says he composed his verses "extempore this morning" (III, iv, 91); again, later, Bobadilla refers Matheo to the art of fencing that Matheo was taught "this morning" (IV, ii, 7). There are no other indications of time in act iv. In act v, however, we learn that IV, i was "betweene one and two," when Lorenzo, Sr. left Musco with Peto; and the false message of IV, iii was delivered to Thorello "After two, sir" (V, iii, 11-14). Lorenzo, Jr., his newly married wife, and Prospero are at a Mermaid supper, but are ordered to Clement's for a feast and entertainment, which must be about six o'clock. Thus, as in the 1616 text, the day's work of twelve hours or so is done on a neoclassical schedule.³

² The time-scheme of the Folio *Every Man in his Humor* is in P. Simpson's edition (Oxford, 1919), p. 117. The act-scene-line notation in this article refers to Ben Jonson, *Works*, eds. Herford and Simpson (Oxford, 1927, 1932), III, IV.

³ Jonson's change is not commented upon by Carl Grabau, in his com-

The revision of *Cynthia's Revels* added many difficulties to Jonson's mastery of the time formula. In the 1616 text of the play, time is not so accurately presented as in *Every Man in*, and is often as indefinite as in *Every Man out*. Miss Buland devotes one sentence to the play: "*Cynthia's Revels* is well within the unity of time." Gutmann says the play "beansprucht 1 Tag und die darauf folgende Nacht. . . . Die Zeitdauer ist ausreichend bemessen."⁴ An analysis of the play, Quarto and Folio, shows that because they fail to consider Jonson's revisions, Miss Buland and Mr. Gutmann are inaccurate. The following is an analysis of time in the folio text:

Cupid and Mercury decide to take the habits of pages, and Echo mourns for Narcissus at the "Fountayne of selfe-Loue" (I, i-ii). Amorphus drinks and receives Asotus as pupil; and Crites satirizes both in his diatribe against vanity (I, iii-v). Asotus says of the hat Amorphus has just borrowed, "It cost mee eight crownes but this morning" (I, iv, 150-51, also I, iv, 179).

Cupid and Mercury insinuate themselves into the employ of Philautia and Hedon (II, i). Anaides boasts to Hedon, "I have devised one or two of the prettiest othes this morning in my bed" (II, ii, 11-12). Amorphus and his pupil arrive at court, whereupon a lesson on faces is given (II, iii). The court ladies appear at "a quarter past eleven" (II, iv, 5). Somewhat after this the servants go in quest of the fountain (II, v). Apparently Amorphus and Asotus were at court with the ladies, because they are told of the fountain (II, v), and because Asotus is advised not to "sinke under the first disaster" at court. Amorphus adds, "I will teach you [courtship] against afternoone. Where eate you today," etc (III, i, 17-22). At the end of the scene, he says, "Come, you shall looke back upon the court againe to day, and be restor'd to your colours" (III, i, 74-75). Hedon and Anaides will revenge themselves on Crites, whose stabbing wit has crossed them at court; and Anaides can not apply a concert, for Moria "comes without her muffle too" (III, ii, 42). Crites then attacks the manners of the court (III,

parison of Quarto with Folio, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xxxviii (1902), 1-97, or by Herford and Simpson, in their introduction to the play, *Jonson, Works* (Oxford, 1925), I, 331-70; or by P. Simpson, in his earlier edition. Gutmann, *op. cit.*, p. 62, is concerned only with the final text in the Folio. H. H. Carter makes no comment on the change in his parallel-text edition of the Quarto and Folio of the play, *Yale Studies in English*, lxx (New York, 1921).

⁴ Mable Buland, *op. cit.*, p. 146; Gutmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-66. Neither A. C. Judson, ed., *Cynthia's Revels*, *Yale Studies in English*, xlv (New York, 1912), nor Herford and Simpson discuss the problem of time in *Cynthia's Revels*.

iv). After the light dinner mentioned in III, i, Asotus is instructed in courtly speech (III, v) for the next meeting at court, to be held in the afternoon.

The courtiers arrive at court again. Asotus suddenly whips out his watch, "Now, by this watch (I marle how forward the day is) I doe unfeignedly vow my selfe (s'light 'tis deeper than I tooke it, past five)" (iv, iii, 39-41). Anaides has seen Asotus at court earlier in the day "I never saw him till this morning" (iv, iii, 76). The game of words takes place, and Argurion faints when Asotus distributes her gifts. The water is brought in (iv, iv). Then Arete announces that Cynthia will not appear this night "Gallants, you are for this night free, to your peculiar delights" (iv, v, 4-5). Amorphus proclaims a public examination of his pupil, instead "he shall this night in court, and in the long gallery, hold his publique Act, by open challenge" (iv, v, 93-6).

Mercury persuades Crites to join with him, in order to inflict just pains at "this nights sport" (v, i, 18). Amorphus, master of the science of courtship, instructs his pupil, Asotus, in colors (v, ii). The mock tilting takes place, parodying courtly modes of love (v, iii-iv). After his victory over Amorphus, the Frenchman Mercury says, "Adieu, Signior. Good faith, I shall drinke to you at supper sir" (v, iv, 536-37). Because Jonson neither specifically mentions a re-supper in *Cynthia's Revels*, nor ever employs the technique of a late supper in any of his plays, it is highly unlikely that we are to understand Mercury's reference to supper in an unusual sense. A simpler explanation considers this reference to be a deviation from verisimilitude and an oversight which, we shall see, are the results of rewriting.

Immediately following the victory of Crites and Mercury in the duello, comes Arete (v, v). She gives notice of Cynthia's wish for a masque, which has been annulled before in favor of the duello. Apparently the masque is to be played the same night, for there is no indication that another day has gone by. It is obvious that Jonson failed to arrange the time-schedule accurately, because the game of words and the long duello are crowded into one hour (from iv, iii, 39-41, "past five," to v, iv, 536-37, before supper). This error may be remedied by having the duello take place earlier in the afternoon, and not during the night. This alteration will preserve the unity of time, which, otherwise, is broken, for the time required would be two nights, as Gutmann believes. But it also necessitates two textual corrections: (1) Arete must not say that Cynthia will not appear at night (iv, v); and (2) the time mentioned by Asotus (iv, iii, 39) must be put back, so that the allusion to supper in v, iv, 536, will stand correct.

At the end of the fifth act, the hymn to Diana opens the masque, and, incidentally, indicates the time: "Now the Sunne is laid to sleepe" (v, vi, 2). The sports are "to be this night" (v, v, 77-78). The following scenes are devoted to the masques and reforms (v, vii-xi), which are concluded "with

declining night" (v, xi, 3) The night is not definitely specified; because the 1616 Folio text is not clear, it may be either the same or the following night.

When a comparison of the 1616 text with the earlier 1601 Quarto text is made, the error in time may be easily understood. The Folio supplies the only text for the duello scenes (v, i-iv), with which Jonson expanded the earlier text. In setting the duello for the night, Jonson also wrote some preparatory lines (iv, v, 76-100, 142-51). And this addition led him to alter the time of the masque, which was indefinitely postponed. The statement of the postponement in the Folio text is an alteration, for, in the 1601 Quarto, the masque takes place at night without change of time. Arete declares (in the Quarto), "Gallants, you must provide for some solemne revels tonight, Cynthia is minded to come foorth."¹⁵ This was changed to "Gallants, you are for this night free, to your peculiar delights; Cynthia will haue no sports" (iv, v, 3-6). This change is inadequate, and does not help to make the time schedule consistent. Other allusions to time consequently lose their true significance.¹⁶

As *Every Man in his Humor* proves, Jonson can be careful to treat unity of time accurately. One of the changes made, that at i, iii, 22-25, supplies us with another piece of evidence, though slight, of Jonson's attempt to make the play conform perfectly to neo-classic rule. Dissolving a minute inconsistency, the correction implies that Jonson was willing to take great pains in order to produce a mechanically perfect work of art as his first great play. The Folio text of *Cynthia's Revels* tells another story. Jonson has been careless: a long satiric afterthought added to the original Quarto text probably caused the oversight that led to a few errors and to the spoiling of the unity of the day.

MARTIN KALLIOH

Baltimore, Maryland

¹⁵ *Cynthia's Revels* (1601), ed. W. Bang and L. Krebs, *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*, Band 22 (Louvain, 1908), p. 68, lines 2247-49.

¹⁶ Jonson had also forgotten to add the duello to the argument placed in the Induction.

THE LICENSE FOR SHAKESPEARE'S MARRIAGE

It is essential that every document relating to the biography of Shakespeare should be available in perfectly accurate transcripts. One of these documents, the entry of 27 November 1582 in the register of the Bishop of Worcester that records the issuance of a license for the marriage of William Shakespeare and Anna Whately, is inaccurately transcribed in every account that has come to my attention. All scholars, with two exceptions, give a transcript that agrees essentially with that of Halliwell-Phillipps:¹ "Item eodem die similis emanavit licencia inter Willielmum Shaxpere et Annam Whateley de Temple Grafton" [contractions are expanded silently in most transcripts]. There is a crux in the fourth word, a contraction, usually printed "sitis,"^{1a} which D. H. Lambert² and C. F. Tucker Brooke³ expand, not as "similis" but as "supradicto." With "similis" the phrase may be translated, "Item, on the same day a *similar* license . . .", and with "supradicto," as "Item, on the same day *aforesaid* a license. . . ." Neither reading of the contracted word is, in my opinion, paleographically acceptable. The matter is not of great importance, but since Gray⁴ has published a clear reproduction of the MS entry, every effort should be made to interpret it accurately.

The loop through the top of the letter "l" permits of several possible expansions. But the reading "supradico" may be rejected at the outset, for a glance at Gray's facsimile is sufficient to reveal that in the contraction are no p's, d's, c's, or t's. The alternate reading "similis" is not so obviously wrong. There can be no question about the first, third, fourth, and fifth letters of the contracted word, s, l, i, and s; but the second letter I take to be, not "i" but "a." If this is correct, the contraction is "satis," and its expansion "salutis."

¹ J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, Seventh edition (London, 1887), II, 396.

^{1a} In the manuscript the letter "l" is crossed by a long horizontal loop, but the conventional "i" is substituted here and below; see McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 321, 324.

² *Certae Shakespeareanae* (1904), p. 3.

³ *Shakespeare of Stratford* (1926), p. 3.

⁴ J. W. Gray, *Shakespeare's Marriage* (1905); the facsimile faces p. 21.

Initial long "s" is frequently linked by a descending curve to the letter following, and examples of the linking of "s" to "a" occur repeatedly in the facsimiles published in Jenkinson's article on handwriting.⁵ In the same scholar's book, *The Later Court Hands in England* (1921), are two other examples, Plate xv. ii, line 2, "satis," and Plate xvii. iii, line 1, "satis." It will be observed that neither of these words is contracted, and hence neither is subject to misreading; and in both words the initial letters "sa" bear a striking resemblance to the letters under discussion.

I have not been able to find an exact parallel to my proposed reading "sañs" (i. e. a contraction of the genitive singular form), but "sañm" (accusative singular) for "salutem" (= "greeting") occurs regularly in legal documents: see Jenkinson's *Later Court Hands*, Plate xxxi. ii, line 1; Plate xxxv. i, line 1; ii, line 1; iv, line 1; v, line 1; vi, line 1; and vii, line 1; Plate xxxvi. i, line 1, and ii, line 2; and Plate xxxvii. i, line 3, and ii, line 5.

The use of "salutis" in giving a date is amply warranted; cf. the title-pages of two of William Camden's books: (1) *Reges, reginae . . . in ecclesia collegiata B. Petri Westmonasterij sepulti, vsque ad annum reparatae salutis 1600* (STC 4518), and (2) *Annales . . . ad Annum Salutis M. D. LXXXIX* (STC 4496a, vol. 1).

The correct reading of the entry in the register of the Bishop of Worcester appears, then, to be: "Item eodem die salutis emanavit licencia . . ." (= "Item, on the same day of salvation a license proceeded . . .").

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Folger Shakespeare Library

A FURTHER NOTE ON DREBBEL'S SUBMARINE

Mr. Kuethe's reconstruction of Drebbel's submarine¹ must be taken, I think, with definite reservations. The passage quoted from Jonson's *The Staple of News* is part of a trenchant satire upon the dishonesty of contemporary news-vendors and the credulity of their

⁵ Hilary Jenkinson: "Elizabethan Handwritings," *The Library*, series 4, iii (1922), 1-34; see Plate xl. A.

¹ "Mechanical Features of a Seventeenth Century Submarine," *Modern Language Notes*, vol. lvi (March, 1941), p. 202.

audience.² Both exaggeration and distortion are the ordinary tools of satirists. Immediately after the reference to Drebbel's contrivance, for example, is a question concerning a new project of Spinola

To bring an army over in corke-shooes,
And land them, here, at Harwich.³

Fitton, the speaker, when asked, "Is't true?" replies, "As true as the rest," a remark which must have represented the satirist's point of view, and which renders dubious the literal authenticity of his earlier descriptions.

There is, as a matter of fact, more information available regarding the structure of this earliest practicable submarine than Kueeth indicates. It is mentioned by Bishop Wilkins, Robert Boyle, Constantyn Huygens, Marin Mersenne, Nicolas Peiresc, and other scientists of the 17th century,⁴ and at least four 20th century writers have collected most of the available information.⁵ In his *De Ster van 1572*, H. A. Naber introduces a sketch drawn by Isaac Beeckman (Arzt und Mathematiker, geb. zu Middleburg um 1570)⁶ and adds his own pictorial version of the boat. And the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1747) supplies a plan and verbal description of a "diving ship, built by order of his most serene highness Charles Landgrave of Hesse Cassel," explaining that "this prince, being told of the extraordinary convenience of the famous diving ship, constructed by Drebbel, commissioned one of the like kind to be attempted."⁷ But the latest and most authentic account is to be found in Tierie's recent biography of Drebbel.

In brief, it is not necessary to depend solely upon Jonson's un-

² In a note addressed to the readers and preceding Act III, Jonson prays them "To consider the Newes here vented, to be none of his Newes, or any reasonable mans; but Newes made like the times Newes, (a weekly cheat to draw many) . . ."

³ Act III, sc. 2.

⁴ See for example Wilkins' *Mathematicall Magick* (London, 1648), p. 178; Boyle, *Works* (London, 1772), vol. III, p. 453; Mersenne, *Cogitata Physico Mathematica* (Paris, 1644), pp. 207-8.

⁵ Maurice Delpench, *La Navigation Sous-Marine à travers les siècles* (Paris, 1907); H. A. Naber, *De Ster van 1572* (Amsterdam, 1907); Farnham Bishop, *The Story of the Submarine* (New York, 1929); Gerrit Tierie, *Cornelis Drebbel (1572-1633)*, (Amsterdam, 1932).

⁶ *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. II.

⁷ Vol. XVII, p. 581. The engineer was Denis Papin (1647-1710).

scientific report as a basis for a reconstruction of the craft. On the other hand, it is probably impossible to determine precisely how the boat appeared to King James and his court.

From the information at his disposal, Delpuech describes it as "un bateau sous-marin, muni de rames pénétrant dans le navire par des poches en cuir imperméables et pouvant plonger jusqu'à 15 pieds sous l'eau."⁸ Boyle asserted that the vessel carried twelve rowers, besides passengers, "one of which is still alive."⁹ Wilkins, analyzing the difficulties of submarine navigation (he is aware of Drebbel's experiment but is interested in improving it "unto publick use and advantage")¹⁰ lists as one of them the difficulty of motion and declares that, "As for the progressive motion of it, this may be effected by the help of severall Oars, which in the outward ends of them, shall be like the fins of a fish to contract and dilate."¹¹ Farnham Bishop visualizes the boat as being simply a large wooden rowboat "decked over and made water-tight by a covering of thick, well-greased leather."¹² Naber's sketch agrees with this description but with the addition of a row of windows.¹³ Except for the extended oars it looks not unlike the gondola of a modern dirigible. Beeckman's drawing depicts a less stream-lined craft—somewhat high-pooped after the fashion of a galleon.¹⁴ Naber thinks it less accurate than his own.

It is to be noted that none of these writers, early or late, suggests that the boat was self-propelled, or that it was supplied with a means of slicing the ribs of enemy ships, or that it was at any time so used.¹⁵

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁹ Boyle's authorities were apparently Mersenne and Dr. Kuffler, the latter Drebbel's son-in-law. Faber, a German savant, reckoned twenty-four passengers, eight of them rowing. Cambridge, in his *Scrabliad*, employs a submarine vessel, and gives Boyle's account of Drebbel's ship as reference.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

¹¹ *Loc. cit.*

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 58. Naber thinks (in 1907) that the rowers were immersed to their necks and that therefore voyages could be made only in summer. (*Ibid.*, p. 60.)

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

¹⁵ But Mersenne speaks of "varia terebella, quibus naves hostiles perforantur et immergantur. . . ." (*Op. cit.*, p. 208.) And Huygens wrote in his autobiography (1631): ". . . it is not hard to imagine what would be

The contrivance sketched in the *Gentleman's Magazine* is more properly a diving bell than a submarine. The plan is of an elliptical or oval wooden tub 6 feet high, 6 feet in its greatest diameter and 3 feet in its least. A large hole in the top serves as entrance. From the top extend two pipes, one to introduce fresh and one to expel foul air, this process effected by a rotatory sucker and forcer.¹⁶ From one side extends a tube through which a man might crawl to affix an explosive to the underside of an enemy ship. The craft is immersed by the skillful use of oars, and by "letting in the external water by a cock." The model looks for all the world like an enormous watering-can.

the usefulness of this bold invention in time of war, if . . . (a thing which I have repeatedly heard Drebbel assert) enemy ships lying safely at anchor could be secretly attacked and sunk unexpectedly by means of a battering ram. . . ." (Quoted by Tierie, *op. cit.*, p. 161) There is here no implication that such an innovation had been attempted. Drebbel, however, did invent for use in Buckingham's expedition to relieve la Rochelle a species of torpedo. A French description of this infernal machine appeared in the *Mercurie François* in 1628: ". . . the English shot ten or twelve floating petards for the purpose of setting fire to the royal French fleet. The body of these petards is of white iron filled with gun-powder and floats on a piece of willow wood, through which a spring is made, which when it encountered the bows of one of the royal ships, took effect, which consisted simply in this, that it threw water into the ship with much power; all the others were captured as they floated on the water and did no harm." (Quoted by Tierie, *ibid.*, p. 73) These are mentioned with the submarine in the "Orders of Buckingham's Expedition" as early as January 26, 1626. Is Jonson describing the torpedo rather than the submarine? De Winter in his edition of the play (*Yale Studies in English*, xxvii (1905), p. xx), holds that Jonson was ". . . inserting allusions to contemporary conditions and events, almost to the date of the second presentation, February 19, 1626." Jonson, Kuethe to the contrary, does not class the contrivance as a boat. It is first referred to as "an invisible Eele," and next as an "Automa." Fitton's subsequent reference to getting the information from "The Eele-boats here, that lye before Queen Hyth," and which "came out of Holland," is almost certainly not to battle-craft but to fishing boats which supplied England with fish and eels. *Of. De Winter, ibid.*, p. 177.

¹⁶ The younger Huygens insists that according to his father's account there was no trace of any apparatus above water. Boyle (*op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 107-8) refers to a flask of "chymical liquor" which, when released, restored vital parts to the air to make it "fit for inspiration." From the evidence of Boyle and others, Tierie infers that Drebbel knew how to prepare oxygen. (*Op. cit.*, p. 70.)

Tierie conceives the boat as having no bottom and as being "a submarine in the form of a diving-bell, rather elongated in shape . . . divided into several compartments."¹⁷ He gives a rough outline of how such a boat might have functioned:

In a diving-boat made in the form of a diving-bell, the pressure, and therefore also the volume, of the air depends on the depth of the boat under water. Let us suppose that the boat is floating under water; if it is then propelled downwards, the pressure on the enclosed air will increase and the volume diminish, with the result that the upward pressure grows less—Archimedes' Principle—and the boat goes deeper and deeper. But if . . . the boat . . . is given an upwards impulse, the air pressure will decrease and so the volume, and with it the upwards pressure, will increase, the boat being thereby made to rise, until it floats above the water.

It follows, therefore, that by simply changing the direction—say by means of a horizontal rudder—the boat may be made to sink or rise. . . . At a certain depth, which Naber calls the 'critical depth,' it is possible to make the boat move forward¹⁸

Drebbel, it appears, measured his depth under water by means of a mercury barometer, steered with the aid of a compass, and by the use of a gas derived from saltpetre made fresh the stale air confined in the boat. This was indeed the remarkable invention of a remarkable man, and the present brief sketch does both scant justice. It may serve, however, to rectify what seem to me ill-founded inferences from the text of Jonson's play.

CLARK EMERY

Indiana University

"MUCK-RAKERS" BEFORE BUNYAN

The substantive *muck-rake* is defined in the *New English Dictionary* as "A rake for collecting 'muck.' In literary use only *fig.*" This note follows:

The source of the figurative use is Bunyan's description of "the Man with the Muck-rake," which was intended as an emblem of absorption in the pursuit of worldly gain; but in modern use it is often made to refer generally to a preference for what is comparatively worthless over that which is valuable, or to a depraved interest in what is morally "unsavory" or scandalous.

Earliest citation of the word is from Bunyan, dated 1684.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 62-3.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 62. Naber himself built such a boat and operated it on this principle in 1922.

In its Supplement (1933) the *NED.* adds the modern sense of the corresponding word *muck-raker*, popularized by Theodore Roosevelt in 1906, as "one who seeks out and publishes scandals and the like about prominent people, esp. public officials." Both the Bunyan reference and the Roosevelt reference are recorded and similarly explained in *Webster's International Dictionary*, Second Edition (1934). The present note concerns use of the term in Bunyan's sense.

Of the memorable picture of the muck-raker in the Second Part of *Pilgrim's Progress* only the first two sentences need to be cited.

The *Interpreter* takes them apart again and has them first into a Room, *where was a man that could look no way but downwards, with a Muck rake in his hand. There stood also one over his head with a Celestial Crown in his Hand, and proffered to give him that Crown for his Muck-rake; but the Man did neither look up, nor regard, but raked to himself the Straws, the small Sticks, and Dust of the Floor.* (*Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. Wharey, 1928, p 211).

No one will fail to render full credit to Bunyan for the composition of this striking picture, nor yet for giving the term popular currency down to the present in its figurative sense. But Bunyan was not the first to use the term "as an emblem of absorption in the the pursuit of worldly gain."

John Bunyan, himself, in *Grace Abounding*, tells us that of the two books inherited by his wife and frequently read by them together one was *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*.¹ This book by Arthur Dent, first issued in 1601,² contains the word *muck-raker* in a passage that for its colorful phrasing deserves, I think, quotation at some length. Antilegon is questioning Theologus about the sin of Covetousness:

Antile. You haue spoken many things very sharply against Couetousnesse: but in my mind, so long as a man couets nothing but his owne, he cannot be said to be couetous.

Theol. Yes, that he may. For not only is he couetous which greedily desireth other mens goods: but euen he also which ouer-niggardly and pinchingly holdeth fast his owne, and is such a miser, that he will part with nothing. We see, the world is full of such pinch-pennies, that will let noth-

¹ See *Grace Abounding* (Cambridge English Classics, 1907), p. 10.

² The copy I have used is among the rare books in the Huntington Library, bearing date of 1603 and author's name.

ing goe; except it be wrung from them perforce, as a key out of *Hercules* hand

These grapple muck-rakers had as leeuve part with their bloud, as their goods. They wil pinch their owne backs and bellies, to get their God into their chests. And when they haue once got him in there, will they easily part with him, trow ye? No, no: a man wil not part with his God, for no man's pleasure. He wil eat Pease-bread, and drinke small drinke, rather then he will diminish his God. (Dent, *Path-way*, pp. 90-91.)

This passage then has *muck-rakers*, used figuratively to mean misers, more than eighty years before Bunyan drew his picture. Apparently, also, it was Dent's language that suggested the idea to Bunyan.

ROBERT ADGER LAW

The University of Texas

KLEIST'S "UNSICHTBARES THEATER"

"Nur schade daß das Stück auch wieder dem unsichtbaren Theater angehört," Goethe wrote (8/28/1807) concerning *Der Zerbrochene Krug*. The remark characterizes more of Kleist's plays than Goethe ever came to know. For in practically every one of Kleist's dramas we find that invisible events, nightly scenes, off-stage happenings are the most important part of the action and often its marked center.

Kleist's few changes in his rendering of Molière's *Amphitryon* make the problematical night (Jupiter with Alcmene) more invisible (by omitting the "Prologue") and yet tremendously more important, even tragic: Kleist's major addition (II, 4-5, the center of the drama) all but drags the equivocal situation into the limelight.

In the same way, *Der Zerbrochene Krug* is based on the mistakes of the unproblematical night (Adam with Eve) when the jug broke. And this invisible scene is brought before the mind's eye most insistently in 7-9, that is, again in the center of the drama.

The invisible center of *Penthesilea* might be another night scene: that night when the first Amazons murdered their husbands, constituted their state, and saw Tanais set the example of self-mangling. This tale, the center of the central scene (15), is fittingly epilogued by Achilles, "ein Traum, geträumt in Morgenstunden."

Kätzchen von Heilbronn has an invisible principal scene, but a whimsical, romantic construction doubles that scene and places the

two versions, not into the central act, but into acts II and IV. Those two acts, seemingly preoccupied with the disconcerting Kunigunde-action, contribute to the main action its real basis, the dream of the future lovers (Wetter and Kathchen) of each other (II, 9 and IV, 2).

It is more difficult, but it is almost necessary, to assume an invisible center for *Hermannsschlacht*. Of all the more or less startling scenes the most incongruous is III, 3, Hermann's tragicomic sport with Thusnelda. While all the other scenes have at least the semblance of a historical play, III, 3 does not refer to historical Rome; it aims undisguisedly at contemporaneous France.¹ Behind and above the chatting pair, the political struggle shines through the thin veil of historical allusion, and an invisible scene dimly glows behind the central scene.

The entire *Prinz Fr. v. Homburg* moves round an invisible axis, the off-stage scene before III, 3: the Prince at the grave destined for him.² To this profoundest sensation of his humanity all the preceding scenes fall down like cascades; from this lowest level of his human dignity all the following scenes ascend like a flight of steps.

Kleist is a powerful dramatist, and large portions of his plays are eminently visible, even splendidly theatrical; but Goethe somehow hit the darkest point in Kleist's dramatics, when he called it "unsichtbares Theater."³

NORBERT FURST

Los Angeles, Calif

¹ See a letter as early as 10/24/1806 (to Ulrike): "Es wäre schrecklich, wenn dieser Wutherich sein Reich grundete. Nur ein sehr kleiner Theil der Menschen begreift, was fur ein Verderben es ist, unter seine Herrschaft zu kommen. Wir sind die unterjochten Völker der Römer. Es ist auf eine Ausplünderung von Europa abgesehen, um Frankreich reich zu machen."

² Cp. F. O. Nolte, *Grillparzer, Lessing and Goethe* (1938), p. 177: "There is an agent in the action incomparably more striking than the State—namely the spectre of death, dramatically no less moving . . . than the spectre of the Ghost in *Hamlet*! It is the sight of the open grave that . . . rocks the consciousness of the reader or spectator."

³ "Das Motiv des Vertrauens im Drama Heinrichs von Kleist" (H. J. Weigand, *Monatshefte*, 1938, 233-245) may be directly related to the "invisible theatre." Cp. Weigand, p. 234: "Freilich steht [der Erlebnis-komplex] nicht immer sichtbar im Mittelpunkt der Handlung, immer aber zeigt er sich innerlich mit dem Kern der Handlung verwachsen und bietet so gewissermaßen den Schlüssel zu Kleists ganzer Dramatik."

OUTWITTING HAZLITT

None of the butts of *Blackwood's Magazine* during its reckless early years were more consistently abused than William Hazlitt and his fictitious pimples. On April 17, 1823, Hazlitt lost all patience and threatened Thomas Cadell, London agent for the magazine, with suit "for damages sustained from repeated slanders and false imputations in that work on me."¹ Cadell was alarmed and would gladly have given up his connection with *Blackwood's*, but his colleagues in Edinburgh took the affair more calmly. Least ruffled of all was Dr. William Maginn, the irresponsible Irishman who had shared in many of the "blackguardisms" of the magazine. On May 13 he wrote to William Blackwood, the publisher, that he was about to set out for London, and that he would gladly undertake "to palaver [Cadell] out of sticking to Hazlitt."²

Then presently the *Edinburgh Review* for May appeared with an article by Hazlitt "On the Periodical Press," which contained the statement: "Of the *Magazines*, which are a sort of *cater-cousins* to ourselves, we would wish to speak with tenderness and respect. There is the Gentleman's Magazine at one extremity of the series, and Mr. Blackwood's at the other. . . ."³ Such talk was more than Maginn could stomach. He answered with a review of Hazlitt's article in "Letters of Timothy Tickler, No. viii," which appeared in *Blackwood's* for August, 1823.⁴ And a scathing review it was; Maginn's wrath was rarely more thoroughly unleashed. The

¹ P. P. Howe, *Life of William Hazlitt* (London, 1922), p. 356.

² Howe, p. 358. For a fuller transcript of the letter, see Mrs. [Margaret] Oliphant's *Annals of a Publishing House: William Blackwood and His Sons* (Edinburgh and London, 1897), pp. 390-392.

³ *Edinburgh Review*, xxxviii (1823), 369.

⁴ The Tickler Letter, a review of the entire issue of the *Edinburgh*, was by Maginn and John Gibson Lockhart, but Maginn was probably sole author of the section devoted to Hazlitt's article. He wrote to Blackwood on August 7: "As for the Edinburgh I shall decidedly do my best. . . . I shall take in hand Greece, Literary Property, & Napoleon—but above all the Periodicals which I know as well as any man in the Euxine—better than some few."

This letter and all others quoted without mention of any other source are copied from the manuscripts preserved in the offices of William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., in Edinburgh.

Edinburgh had, he insisted, fallen on evil days; Francis Jeffrey must be utterly bereft of pride, for "he has suffered William Hazlitt, author of the *Liber Amoris*, an old newspaper-monger—a gentleman of the press, that has lived all his days by scribbling dramatic criticisms, and leading paragraphs, and so forth, for the different London newspapers and magazines;—he has suffered this low, vulgar, impudent gentleman of the press—the writer of that filthy book, which but for its dulness, and the obscurity of its author, must long ere now have been burnt by 'the hands of the common hangman';—he has suffered this despicable member of the Cockney School to write an Essay in the *Edinburgh Review* on 'the Periodical Press of Britain.' Francis Jeffrey has been obliged to swallow this bitter pill."⁵

In the following month Maginn continued his denunciation of Hazlitt in the ninth Tickler Letter, a review of Hazlitt's last article in the *New Monthly*.⁶ He answered Hazlitt's old charges of scurrility in *Blackwood's* by citing the critic's remarks about Fuseli in "On the Old Age of Artists." More surprising, however, was his defense of the adjective *pimpled*, so often and so unjustly applied to Hazlitt. "None of us knows anything about his personal appearance—," Maginn protested, "how could we?—But what designation could be more apt to mark the scurvy, verrucose, uneven, foully-heated, disordered, and repulsive style of the man? He interpreted us *au pied du lettre*, and took much pains to convict us of slander."⁷

Hazlitt may have renewed his threats to sue after reading these two articles. There must have been repercussions of some sort, for on January 22, 1824, Maginn wrote to Blackwood: "You are blamed for attacking obscure Londoners—most particularly Hazlitt. He is really too insignificant an animal. Make it a rule that his name be *never* mentioned by any of your friends: I for one will keep it." Anyone familiar with Maginn would be surprised to find him imposing any such limitation on himself. Indeed the publisher must have been taken aback—or perhaps he knew Maginn well enough to take what he said with a grain of salt.

⁵ *Blackwood's Magazine*, xiv (1823), 221.

⁶ For proof that Maginn wrote "Tickler, No. ix," see the letter from Blackwood to John Wilson quoted in Mrs. [Mary] Gordon's *Christopher North, a Memoir of John Wilson* (New York, 1863), p. 266.

⁷ *Blackwood's*, xiv, 311.

At all events Maginn adhered to his resolution not to mention Hazlitt's name. Then presently he learned of an attack on Sir Walter Scott, originally included in Hazlitt's review of *Peveril of the Peak* in the *London Magazine* for February, 1823, but deleted by the editors after only a few copies had been printed. The secret was too good to keep, and Maginn itched to disclose it to the public—the more so because he knew that few readers would not agree with him in excoriating one who could call Scott “The wisest, meanest of mankind.”

But how was he to go about the task without mentioning Hazlitt? He found the answer to the question in a perfectly simple device. “The article was by Hazlitt,” he wrote when he submitted his paper to Blackwood, “. . . but it is better to say Taylor for it will vex much more and perhaps bring an explanation.”⁸ Accordingly John Taylor, editor of the *London Magazine*, was blamed for the attack on Scott and was severely censured for it in Maginn's “Profligacy of the London Periodical Press” (August, 1824). The hoax was perfect from the Blackwoodians' point of view: it said what needed to be said but avoided the serious outcome which they might expect if they assailed Hazlitt directly.

Maginn was evidently well pleased with his ruse, for he tried it again in the following month in a reply to Hazlitt's *Edinburgh Review* article on Shelley's newly published *Posthumous Poems*.⁹ This time Barry Cornwall was obliged to take the blame for Hazlitt's work, and he was showered with ridicule for presuming to pose as a literary critic. “You read Goethe!” Maginn chided. “You pretend to judge his style! Go—go, man.—Go—to—a tea-drinking, go—and there gabble pretty jobbernowlisms on the sky

⁸ Maginn was right, Taylor immediately published a denial of the charges in the *Blackwood's* article, adding that he had deleted the attack on Scott because of his “good feeling” for Sir Walter rather than through any fear of reprisals. Maginn replied in “Profligacy of the London Periodical Press, No. 11” in *Blackwood's* for October. He removed from his original statement all the charges which Taylor had denied; pointed out that, even without them, the article was shamefully slanderous; reaffirmed his charges no less strenuously, and lent force to them by ferreting out another offensive reference to Scott in the same issue of the *London*.

⁹ The article in *Blackwood's* was presented as “Letters of Mr. Mullion, No. 1.” It is proved to be Maginn's by its inclusion in a list of his 1824 contributions to the magazine, set down in a letter which he wrote to Blackwood on April 25, 1825.

gods, and the white creatures, and the—Faugh, I cannot go on.”¹⁰ His treatment of Shelley, however, was far less good-humored and touched at times the ultimate in poor taste; for example, when considering Hazlitt’s remark that Shelley died with a volume of Keats in his pocket, Maginn comments: “But what a rash man Shelley was, to put to sea in a frail boat with Jack’s poetry on board! Why, man, it would sink a trireme . . . Seventeen ton of pig-iron would not be more fatal ballast. Down went the boat with a ‘swirl!’ I lay a wager that it righted soon after ejecting Jack.”¹¹

Evidently Maginn’s devious method of attack succeeded in its purpose, for Hazlitt never carried out his threat to sue Cadell. The hoax has proved, indeed, more of a success than its perpetrator could have imagined; it has been accepted in good faith by two scholars of our own century. Mr. Bertram Dobell was obviously unaware of Maginn’s ruse when he wrote, in discussing the “Profligacy” article: “The review [of *Peveril of the Peak*], absurdly enough, was attributed to John Taylor . . . and he was accused of blackguardism for having written it, and cowardice for having suppressed it.”¹² And Mr. Richard Armour seems to have been even further misled by the reply to Hazlitt’s review of Shelley, for he accepts the review as Cornwall’s and lists it among the latter’s contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*.¹³ Maginn would, of course, have been delighted to know that the trick designed to annoy “Table Talk Billy” outlived its immediate purpose and years later ensnared two other critics.

RALPH M. WARDLE

Cornell University

¹⁰ *Blackwood's*, xvi (1824), 289.

¹¹ *Blackwood's*, xvi, 288.

¹² *Sidelights on Charles Lamb* (London, 1903), p. 211.

¹³ *Barry Cornwall* (Boston, 1935), p. 354. The review was certainly Hazlitt’s. John Hunt and Mrs. Shelley both refer to him as the author in contemporary letters (Howe, *Life of William Hazlitt*, pp. 372-373); the article is reprinted as his in both Waller and Glover’s and Howe’s editions of his works; and it is attributed to him in the bibliographies of his work by W. C. Hazlitt, Alexander Ireland, and Jules Douady, as well as W. A. Copinger’s *On the Authorship of the First Hundred Numbers of the “Edinburgh Review”* (Manchester, 1895).

"THE EVE OF ST. AGNES" AND "THE LEGEND OF
BRITOMARTIS"

Scholars have given considerable attention to the sources of "The Eve of St. Agnes," in which Keats followed his own advice to Shelley to "load every rift of your subject with ore."¹ This phrase echoes Spenser's "And with riche metall loaded every rifte,"² and the use of music in the opening stanzas is reminiscent of both Shakespeare and Spenser; moreover Keats's interest in the effects these poets achieved with music is amply demonstrated by the underscorings in his volumes of their works.³ Miss Lowell has suggested as the probable source for "The silver snarling trumpets gan to chide" two lines Keats underscored: "A shrilling Trumpet sounded from on high" and "With Shaumes, and Trumpets, and with Clarion sweet";⁴ but Keats's copy of *The Faerie Queene*, on which Miss Lowell based her comments, contained only Book I; actually there are closer parallels later in the poem: "The silver sounding instruments did meet," "She heard a shrilling trompet sound alowd," and "Then shrilling trompets loudly gan to bray."⁵ The last of these lines must have appealed to Spenser for we find a variation of it in Book III, "The Legend of Britomartis":

The whiles a most delitious harmony
In full straunge notes was sweetly heard to sound,
That the rare sweetnesse of the melody
The feeble sences wholly did confound,
And the frayle soul in deepe delight nigh drown'd:
And when it ceased, *shrill trompets loyd did bray.*
That their report did far away rebound
And when they ceast, it gan againe to play,
The whiles the maskers marched forth in trim aray.⁶

In this stanza we have not only a verbal parallel, but also the same contrast between the two kinds of music we have in Keats's poem,

¹ To Shelley, August 1820. The source is noted also by Maurice Buxton Forman, *The Letters of John Keats* (Oxford, 1935), p. 507.

² *F. Q.*, II, vii, 28.

³ Amy Lowell, *John Keats* (Boston, n. d.), II, 545-578, and Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Keats's Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1928).

⁴ Miss Lowell, I, 102.

⁵ *F. Q.*, II, xii, 71; III, xii, 1; IV, iv, 48.

⁶ *F. Q.*, III, xii, 6.

where the "prelude soft" is followed by chiding trumpets, and both poets emphasize the effect of the softer music. Also in the first few stanzas of Canto xii there is music heard from afar, a gay gathering of people, and a stormy night—all of which are in Keats's poem.

There are many similarities between the story of Madeline and that of Britomart. Although some of these are romantic commonplaces, they are so numerous that it is unwise to ignore them: Britomart is "full of fancies fraile," Madeline is "asleep in lap of legends old";⁷ Madeline has a "soft chilly nest," Britomart a "soft fethered nest";⁸ Porphyro stealthily approaches the sleeping Madeline "noiseless as fear," just as Malecasta comes to Britomart's couch with "fearful feete";⁹ Porphyro "listened to her breathing," Malecasta "lend her wary eare to understand If any pufte of breath or sign of sence shee fond";¹⁰ in both narratives there is a banquet.¹¹

The following lines are close to Keats's awakening scene:

And to his wife, that now full soundly slept,
He whispered in her eare, and did her tell,
That it was he, which by her side did dwell,
And therefore prayd her wake, to hear him plaine.
As one out of a dreame not waked well,
She turned her, and returned back againe;
Yet her for to awake he did the more constraîne.¹²

We find also that Keats underlined "Her Eye-lids blew" and that Madeline slept "an azure-lidded sleep";¹³ sleep "oppressed" her limbs and Spenser used that verb in connection with sleep three times.¹⁴

⁷ *F. Q.*, III, ii, 27; Keats, 135.

⁸ Keats, 250; *F. Q.*, III, i, 60.

⁹ Keats, 235; *F. Q.*, III, i, 58.

¹⁰ Keats, 426; *F. Q.*, III, i, 60.

¹¹ Compare Keats's description with *F. Q.*, III, i, 51. In I, v, 4 Keats underscored these lines:

They bring them wines of Greece and Araby
And daintie spices fetcht from furthese Ynd.

Another feast, described in I, xii, 14, was not underscored by Keats, but he did mark the richer description in the 38th stanza, which includes descriptions of odors and music as well as of food.

¹² *F. Q.*, III, x, 49.

¹³ Miss Lowell, *op. cit.*, II, 553; Keats, 263.

¹⁴ Spenser, *Virgils' Gnat*, 239; *F. Q.*, III, 55; v, vi, 34.

It may be that "part at least of the composite picture of the old Beldame is surely Juliet's nurse,"¹⁵ but Spenser also furnished suggestions for the sketch of Angela, including, probably, her name. Britomart had an "aged nourse" whom she addressed as "Beldame," and the phrase "with meagre face deform" should be compared with Spenser's "With heary glib deform'd, and meiger face."¹⁶

Borrowing from several minor authors but primarily from Shakespeare and Spenser, Keats made particular use of "The Legend of Britomartis" in "The Eve of St. Agnes."

MINNIE E. WELLS

Frederick, Maryland

A CORRECTION IN BYRON SCHOLARSHIP

In a note to *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, E. H. Coleridge remarks that Byron had written an article on Sir William Gell's *Geography and Antiquities of Ithaca* (1807) and *Itinerary of Greece* (1808) for the *Monthly Review* of August 1811.¹ This misconception he restates in a note to Byron's letters,² and, as an appendix to the first volume of the *Letters and Journals*, he reprints the review as the work of Byron.³ The result is that the review has been generally accepted as an example of Byron's critical writing⁴—an error which should be corrected even though its effect is trivial enough.

The review was written by Francis Hodgson, as is clearly indicated in the editor's file of the *Monthly Review*.⁵ Hodgson, a friend of Byron, was a regular contributor, and it was at his suggestion that Byron wrote two articles for that journal in 1812 and 1813.⁶ But there is no evidence that Byron had been asked to

¹⁵ M. R. Ridley, *Keats' Craftsmanship* (Oxford, 1933), p. 125.

¹⁶ *P. Q.*, III, iii, 56 and 58; III, ii, 30; IV, viii, 12.

¹ *Poetry*, III, 279, n. 1.

² *Letters and Journals*, I, 265, n. 1.

³ *Letters and Journals*, III, 350-65.

⁴ For example, see Clement Tyson Goode, *Byron as Critic*, Weimar, 1923, pp. 128-32.

⁵ I am indebted for this information to Benjamin C. Nangle, who is preparing for publication the second series of his index to the contributors to the *Monthly Review*.

⁶ Reprinted in *Letters and Journals*, II, 413-23.

review Gell's books, and internal evidence in the review itself substantiates Mr. Nangle's assertion.

Byron returned to London from Greece late in July 1811. Even if he had had time to prepare a review for the August issue of the magazine, he would never have written as follows.

. . . and several of them [the drawings in Gell's book], as we have been assured by eye-witnesses of the scenes which they describe, do not compensate for their mediocrity in point of execution, by any extraordinary fidelity of representation. Others, indeed, are more faithful, according to our informants.

. . . but we have some other and more important remarks to make on his general directions to Grecian tourists; and we beg leave to assure our readers that they are derived from travellers who have lately visited Greece.⁷

He was inordinately proud of his firsthand knowledge of the East and more often than not seized the opportunity of expressing that pride. Nor does the temper of the review agree with Byron's other prose—the Bowles polemics, for example. Hodgson, who had never been in the East, could possibly have turned to Byron for information while preparing his criticism, and since there is no reason for questioning the accuracy of the editor's files, the review of Gell's books may confidently be assigned to Hodgson.

HAROLD S. L. WIENER

Cornell University

THE AUTHORSHIP OF SOME NINETEENTH-CENTURY PLAYS

The following plays listed under unknown authors in Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Nineteenth Century Drama 1800-1850*, Vol. II, "Hand-list of Plays Produced between 1800 and 1850," are here identified.

Abou Hassan; or, The Sleeper Awake (Pav. T. 20/11/1810)

W. [?] Upton. Notation of authorship on title-page of manuscript submitted to the Examiner of Plays, *Larpent Plays in The Huntington Library*, no. 1637. See Nicoll, *Hand-list*, p. 405.

The Animated Effigy (Sans P. T. 12/2/1811)

Jane M. Scott, daughter of John Scott, builder and manager of the

⁷ *Letters and Journals*, I, 351-360; italics mine.

- Sans Pareil Manuscript submitted to the Examiner of Plays endorsed "written by J M Scott," *Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no 1660. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p 387
- The Brown Devil; or, The Charmed Pirate* (L C. 16/1/1830)
Frederic C Nantz. Notation of authorship on manuscript submitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS, British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 355.
- The Castle of Wolfenstein, or, The Accusing Spirit* (Olym M. 10/11/1828)
Thomas J. Thackeray. Author's name on title-page of manuscript submitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS, British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 402.
- The Humours of an Election* (Adel M 9/1/1837)
Joseph S Coyne Author's name on title-page of manuscript submitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS, British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p 274
- The Inscription; or, The Indian Hunters* (Sans P M 28/2/1814)
Jane M. Scott Manuscript submitted to the Examiner endorsed "written by Miss Jane Scott Feby 21, 1814," *Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no. 1804. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 387.
- The Island; or, Christian and his Comrades* (S. W M. 28/7/1823)
Douglas W. Jerrold. Walter Jerrold, *Douglas Jerrold, Dramatist and Wit*, 2 vols., London, Hodder and Stoughton, n.d., II, 660. Lord Chamberlain's MSS., British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 321.
- The Lady Killer* (Surrey S. 15/10/1831)
Douglas W. Jerrold. Walter Jerrold, *op cit.*, II, 662, Lord Chamberlain's MSS, British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 321.
- Lie upon Lie; or, The Two Spanish Valets* (Sans P. 26/10/1818)
Jane M. Scott Manuscript submitted to the Examiner endorsed on title-page "written by Miss Scott," *Larpent Plays in The Huntington Library*, no. 2051. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p 387.
- Loves of the Stars* (Adel M 30/9/1833)
William Lemankedy Author's name on title-page of manuscript submitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS, British Museum. In the title of this copy 'Stars' has been substituted for 'Angels,' which is crossed out This may be the same as the *Loves of the Angels* performed at the City M. 11/3/1833.
- The Maid of Moffat Dale, or, The Inn of Glendery* (Olym 6/5/1825)
John T. Haines. Author's name on title-page of manuscript submitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS., British Museum. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 312.
- The Row of Ballynavogue; or, The Lily of Lismore* (Sans P. Th. 27/11/1817)
Jane M. Scott. Manuscript submitted to the Examiner endorsed "by Jane Scott." *Larpent Plays in The Huntington Library*, no. 1994. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 387.
- She Wants a Guardian* (St. J. 1837)
Joseph S. Coyne. Author's name on title-page of manuscript sub-

mitted to the Examiner, Lord Chamberlain's MSS., British Museum.
See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 274.

The Vizier's Son, The Merchant's Daughter and the Ugly Woman, or, The Maid of Bagdad (Sans P. M. 16/12/1811)

Jane M. Scott. Notation on manuscript submitted to the Examiner, *Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no. 1697. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 387.

Whackham and Windam, or, The Wrangling Lawyers (Sans P T 25/1/1814)

Jane M. Scott¹ Notation on manuscript submitted to the Examiner, where the title runs *Broad Grins; or, Whackham and Windham, the Wrangling Lawyers, Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no. 1798. See Nicoll, Hand-list, p. 387.

MAJL EWING

University of California at Los Angeles

REVIEWS

Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays. By PAUL V. KREIDER. Princeton University Press, for the University of Cincinnati, 1941. Pp. xii + 306. \$3.50.

The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays. By JOHN ERSKINE HANKINS. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. xi + 264. \$3.00.

The Life and Works of George Turberville. By JOHN ERSKINE HANKINS. University of Kansas Publications, Humanistic Studies No. 25. Lawrence, Kansas, 1940. Pp. v + 98. \$1.00.

The Poems of Sir John Davies. Reproduced in facsimile and edited by CLARE HOWARD. New York: Columbia University Press, for the Facsimile Text Society, 1941. Pp. x + 250. \$3.00.

Ignatius His Conclave. By JOHN DONNE. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611 with an introduction by

¹ Miss Scott also wrote the libretto of *Il Giorno Felice* (Sans P. Th. 27/2/1812). Manuscript submitted to the Examiner endorsed "written by J. M. Scott," *Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, no. 1705. This is written in English and subtitled *The Happy Day*. Nicoll lists it among Italian Operas, Hand-list, p. 552. Miss Scott was probably the author of many more pieces produced at the Sans Pareil under her father's management which terminated in 1819.

CHARLES M. COFFIN. New York. Columbia University Press, for the Facsimile Text Society, 1941. Pp. xxiv + 158. \$1.60.

Divine Vengeance: A Study in the Philosophical Backgrounds of the Revenge Motif as It Appears in Shakespeare's Chronicle History Plays. By SISTER MARY BONAVENTURE MROZ. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1941. Pp. x + 168.

The Elizabethan Sermon, A Survey and a Bibliography. By ALAN FAGER HERR. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1940. Pp. 170.

Robert Gould, Seventeenth Century Satirist. By EUGENE HULSE SLOANE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1940. Pp. iv + 126.

Professor Kreider divides his work into two sections on mechanics and aesthetics. In the first, a chapter on the mechanics of disguise points out that Shakespeare used relatively few patterns, and these with practically no change in method, from the beginning to the end of his career. Six chapters follow on Shakespeare's repetition in the treatment of his villains. In the second part Shakespeare's philosophy of sleep is applied to *Macbeth* with the conclusion that the theme-idea of sleep, grotesquely and ironically contrasted with the theme-idea of blood, is dominant in the tragedy. The unity of *Lear* is dependent upon Shakespeare's perception of the significance of the blinding of Gloucester, and this crucial scene is forecast and then echoed by persistently recurring images of sight. *As You Like It* is studied for its images of the out-of-doors and then as Shakespeare's genial and conscious satire on repetitive romantic conventions in his own work and the plays of his fellows.

Professor Kreider's rather debatable point of view is that Shakespeare was more interested in poetic expression than in plot and character types; hence the poet was usually content to follow certain standardized patterns of episode and characterization with no discernible chronological development in their mechanical handling. His genius, Professor Kreider concludes, demonstrated its independence from mere form in that Shakespeare achieved by poetic means an unequalled variety and excellence despite his reliance on repetitive plot and character patterns. Indeed, by the conscious repetition of ideas and imagery he secured a stricter unity of plot, tone, and effect than would otherwise have obtained.

This book does not altogether fulfill the promise manifest in its title, since its subjects are too scattered and fragmentary to provide an adequate basis for really general conclusions. There is little attempt to distinguish between necessitous and artistic repeti-

tion in the section on mechanics, and simple descriptive tabulation too often takes the place of really analytical discussion. The chapters on Shakespeare's villains are partly vitiated by Professor Kreider's omission of all borderline characters. Certain situations such as the villains' disposal of their accomplices are treated inadequately, and there is a too slight analysis of the kinds of revengeful motives held by the villains. The point of view is almost exclusively that of a scholar alone in his study with the printed text. How this episode, this piece of dialogue, that bit of characterization would appear on the living stage to an audience is seldom considered except by subjective speculation. Since Shakespeare was not an isolated phenomenon, conclusions about his stock mechanics lose value and interest unless they are associated with more important and fundamental elements in his plot structure and are related to the background of his predecessors' and contemporaries' practises.

Professor Kreider, of course, does not claim to have treated the entire subject but only certain aspects of it. One feels, however, that the work would have gained if it had confined itself either to the mechanics or the aesthetics and had been conceived more as a unified examination. However, the first section does bring together a considerable body of material which it is useful to have recalled to one's memory, and the second part has some interesting things to say. An appendix with complete references to several hundred recurrent situations in Shakespeare should prove valuable to students.

Professor Hankins' first book contains an extensive essay "The Character of Hamlet" and seven short pendent essays "Politics in *Hamlet*," "Misanthropy in Shakespeare," "On Ghosts," "Religion in *Hamlet*. The Bible," "Repentance," "Suicide in Shakespeare," and "Notes on the Structure of Hamlet," all of which have some bearing on the topics discussed in the first section. The writer's main purpose is to explain "the ideal elements of [Hamlet's] mind, which are above and behind one's conduct in the world of practical affairs." From this point of view he analyzes Hamlet's thoughts and actions against the Elizabethan background. Hamlet represents "the thoughtful man of Elizabeth's reign who seeks for some right principle of conduct by which to make difficult decisions." The double duty of securing justice on Gertrude as well as Claudius is emphasized for its important implications, as well as the struggle in Hamlet's mind which tears him between justice and honor as two principles of conduct both admirable but one indicating that his course is wrong, the other that it is right.

No summary of Professor Hankins' position would be fair in such short space. In general he builds on Bradley while not neglecting the fruits of modern scholarship and constructs a sensible and

in essentials plausible synthesis of the most accepted present day opinions. Certain of his analyses, such as his presentation of the five different attitudes toward ghostly visitation prevalent in Elizabethan times and their significance in the play, are extremely valuable. Occasionally one may query such a snap judgment as that Laertes acts according to the customary code of honor of Shakespeare's time. Professor Hankins' paralleling of Hamlet's thought with Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* is of considerable interest, as is his more tentative suggestion that Plato's *Gorgias* may not have been unknown to Shakespeare. The reasoned critical analysis and the consistent attempt throughout to survey the play against its background make this book a contribution to the study of *Hamlet*.

Professor Hankins also is the author of a useful brief survey of the life and works of George Turberville, a poet at the heart of the group which follows Tottel's *Miscellany* and one whose work serves as a faithful mirror of the literary tendencies of that period so important in evaluating the growth of the later Elizabethan poets. In the section on Turberville's life Professor Hankins is able to correct some facts; but it is to be regretted that so little actually new was turned up, especially about Turberville's relations with Anne Russell, Countess of Warwick, whom the poet frequently celebrates. But since this study seems to have been made without benefit of research in England, perhaps no more could be gleaned. The account of Turberville's possible connection with the publication of Gascoigne's *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* is by no means full or accurate. Professor Hankins seems to be aware only of one of Ward's untrustworthy articles on this much discussed subject; and when he implies that Turberville may have gathered and edited *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, he reveals that he has not read Dr. Greg's articles on the *Flowres*, supplemented by an article of mine, which show that Gascoigne alone was responsible although Turberville may have lent his initials to the prefatory material. For the final word on this episode in the life of Turberville we shall have to await Professor Prouty's forthcoming biography of Gascoigne. The remainder of the book is given over to short discussions of Turberville's individual works. Some problems of dating are solved and there are some brief remarks about his sources, style, and literary merits, but no close analyses. These are perhaps being held in reserve for Professor Hankins' edition of Turberville's poems, which one hopes will soon find a publisher. There is a useful catalogue of Turberville's works, both of the original editions and modern reprints.

Professor Houghton's facsimile edition, made by the offset process from Huntington copies of Sir John Davies' poems, offers a collection of Davies' published works except for poems printed in anthologies. The manuscript "Gulling Sonnets" are reproduced

from the Chetham Society edition. An excellent critical introduction is appended and there are brief notes. The facsimile process was successful except for places in the reproduction of "Orchestra" where the type is small and the bad inking of the copy chosen makes for some difficulty in reading. In these bibliographical days there is much to be said for such facsimile editions, but an editor, in my opinion, should not therefore be released from the labor of collation to determine whether the formes are corrected or invariant, so that the most correct original text may be made available; nor should all possible emendations be ruled out from the notes. We need a philosophy of editing facsimile texts, and such editors must recognize that they have further bibliographical duties than merely printing the text in facsimile, especially when no other good editions, as here, are available to the scholar.

Professor Coffin's edition of Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* is more modest in its purpose, only a brief historical and bibliographical introduction being provided and no notes. The facsimile reproduction from the Huntington copy is clear and this little book provides a welcome inexpensive edition of the text.

Sister Mary Mroz attempts a study of the revenge motive in English thought "in its historical development and modifications from primitive pagan concepts to those of the English Renaissance." Perhaps to bring the work within the bounds of a dissertation in English, a chapter is appended in which the revenge motives in Shakespeare's historical plays are briefly described. Various chapters survey the Renaissance concept of divine vengeance and its human agents, the contemporary criminal law and blood feud, the concept of revenge against tyranny, and the reaction against private vengeance. Because of the attempted scope of the work Sister Mary is able to give only a very general and not wholly unified picture; hence her study provides a useful supplement to already existing books, but it would have proved of greater value if it had not been spread so thin. Many previously unnoted and pertinent quotations are provided in this work, and there has been a considerable study of original background sources. The promise of early historical research is not entirely fulfilled except by quotations from encyclopedias.

Dr. Herr's investigation of Elizabethan sermons is notable for his catalogue of 513 published volumes containing in all about 1200 sermons, a unique list which will need to be referred to by every future student of the form. The list extends to 1603; however, sermons preached before this date but published later are included as well as all reprints through 1610. Dr. Herr has found about a dozen volumes not listed in the S. T. C., and has eliminated several "ghosts" from that work. Considerable as was the labor of compilation, one could wish that Dr. Herr had carried it a few steps farther for the benefit of those who will need to consult him.

Collections of sermons are listed only under their general titles and the titles of the individual sermons in them are not provided. This, I think, should have been a necessity. More captiously, one could have hoped for a line under each sermon detailing its general subject, since the titles of so many are quite ambiguous. Prefixed to this catalogue is a series of short chapters surveying various aspects of the Elizabethan sermon, its vogue, delivery, forms, printing, and literary value. These by necessity are considerably condensed and generalized; but they do provide an excellent background for the subject, and the definitive working out of the specific problems of each may well await future dissertations.

Dr. Sloane has written a competent dissertation study of the minor satirist and dramatist of the late seventeenth century, Robert Gould. Gould was doomed by his natural talents and narrow education to be a hanger-on about the skirts of literature; but he is worth remembering as the author of the allusive satire "The Play-House," an attack on Dryden called "The Laureate," and a fairly successful reworking of Shirley's *Maid's Tragedy* in *The Rival Sisters*. Gould's life is traced and his works are surveyed with the necessary liberal quotation. An appended bibliography of his publications does not adopt the best methods of bibliographical description. Since Gould's works are hard to come by, many students of the late seventeenth century will find Dr. Sloane's work an entirely adequate substitute for the duty of reading the poems themselves.

FREDSON BOWERS

The University of Virginia

The Mind of a Poet. A Study of Wordsworth's Thought with Particular Reference to "The Prelude." By RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. Pp. xviii + 670. \$5.00.

Since the appearance of Arnold's essay on Wordsworth, it has been the fashion in certain quarters to make light of that poet's "thought" and to base a qualified admiration for his work either upon its "moral" tone (Arnold's "criticism of life") or on the imaginative felicity of occasional passages. Now, if there ever was a poet in whom it is impossible to disengage what he perceived and felt from what he thought, in whom the imagination was deeply grounded in a complex of intellectual concepts, it is Wordsworth. And Professor Havens, in his study of the poet's mind, has made a notable contribution to our understanding, and through that to our esthetic appreciation, of his poetic art. In style and method this is a model of literary scholarship—exempt from wilfulness and

eccentricity, well-informed, patient, methodical, lucid, discriminating, judicious, and exceptionally free from bias and *parti pris*. It is always a relief in literary studies to find a scholar looking close and coolly at the facts before him, undistracted by the need to prove some theory in which his emotions are too deeply engaged.

The first part of the book consists of chapters on aspects which can be separately discussed, but which build up to a consistent picture of Wordsworth's mentality—his matter-of-factness, which contributed so much to his truth and substance, his passionateness of feeling, the ministry of fear in shaping his imaginative life, his fondness for solitude and silence, without morbidity; and then various aspects of his cosmic philosophy, culminating in his theory of the imagination, the essential faculty of a poet. The second part is a line-by-line commentary on *The Prelude*, which, taken with de Selincourt's edition of the two texts, furnishes a full and detailed apparatus for the study of that poem. It is impossible here even to list the many various subjects illuminated in these comments—the variations in the several texts considered in connection with both the poet's thought and his art of expression; the plan of the poem and the fitness of various parts for carrying it out; features of Wordsworth's life, reading, and opinions that have a bearing on it, such as his attitude toward political events, and notable omissions, such as the affair with Annette and circumstances of his life in London. Much space is devoted to elucidation of difficult passages, illustration and discrimination of meanings given to words of varying signification, like nature, reason, fancy, power. There is also a very helpful introductory account of what the poem was intended and not intended to be, and what it is. Here, it seems to me, Mr. Havens is in much closer agreement, essentially, with Herbert Read, than he realizes; except that Read takes more into account the process of unconscious rationalizing which was presumably as active in Wordsworth as in most poets, and which is a reflection not on a poet's honesty but on his objectivity. In the long run the psychologist will have to be heard on the subject; but the literary scholar is doubtless well advised to stick to the overt facts—he will thereby at least avoid the speculative vagaries to which the psychologist is at present so liable.

Of the chapters of Part I, particularly illuminating are those on Wordsworth's anti-rationalism (his sense of the inadequacy of mere critical analysis to serve the needs of our spiritual nature), on his mystic experiences (which he does not recognise as such), his religious positions, and his theory of the imagination. It is the chapters on "Animism" and "Nature" which most often make one wish for an opportunity to thresh out certain matters with the author in person. I cannot understand his insistence that the poet's interpretation of nature in childhood and youth was inspired by nothing but "nature" itself, and that his "animism" was a kind

of (atavistic?) return to the views of primitive man. Wordsworth's philosophy of nature was doubtless built up gradually. But it is hard to imagine how "fountains, meadows, hills, and groves" could without assistance teach a boy to think of themselves as haunted by "tutelary Powers." All men breathe a cultural atmosphere thick with concepts of popular mythology and metaphysics. Wordsworth could hardly have been immune to the influences of Christianity and local superstition, and this from the beginning. At an early age he had learned by heart large portions of Shakespeare, Milton, and Spenser. He read Latin in school even before he went to Hawkshead, there he listened to the tales of Dame Tyson; with "Matthew" he drank "the secret cup of still and serious thought," and with the Pedlar "often touched abstrusest matter." He read the *Arabian Nights* and Alexander Pope. And in a poem from his fourteenth year he speaks of "searching the mystic cause of things" and "following Nature to her secret springs."

As for his "animism" (taking the word strictly), none of the instances given seem to me admissible as anything more than figures of speech, expressive of the esthetic delight of the poet, or his sense of the moral effect produced upon him by his communion with nature. "The Moon doth with delight / Look round her when the heavens are bare"—is that any more animistic than "the sunshine is a glorious birth," immediately following? In this matter Mr. Havens is much more critical and discriminating than Mr. Rader, whom he cites; but he follows Rader in making the term "animism" apply to several quite distinct philosophical attitudes. One is that of primitive man in attributing a spiritual personality to natural objects and elements. This had its popular equivalent in European thought in the demonology of which Coleridge was so fond; but Coleridge complains that his friend was too "matter-of-fact" to take stock in such notions.

Another quite different matter is what is often called "vitalism," the disposition of certain biologists to allow some measure of spontaneity and self-direction to the lower animal and vegetable forms and even to inanimate things. This vitalism characterizes the evolutionary theories of Samuel Butler (after Lamarck). It derives its plausibility from the recognition of some degree of sentiency in the lower animal and vegetable worlds—the downward continuity of psychic life—as noted in Erasmus Darwin's *Zoönomia*; and was a literal justification for Wordsworth's half-belief that pleasure was shown by twigs and by flowers in their "breathing." A related notion is that of "pan-psychism," arrived at by a more metaphysical route, on the basis of a supposed continuity between mind and the objective world. This is in many cases a respectable form of idealism, as in the modern work of Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne. It is frequently taken up in the effort to get round the contradictions of "mechanism," or to account for the elements of design,

direction, and meaning in the universe. It most often appears in combination with a quasi-scientific vitalism, as in Shelley's "Queen Mab." It is in this form at the root of Cudworth's "plastic nature," Henry More's "spirit of nature," Berkeley's "anima mundi," and the "active principle" of Newton and of much eighteenth-century theological and scientific thought. It has probably something to do with Wordsworth's youthful propensity to give a "moral life" to "every natural form, rock, fruit or flower."

The problem is to account for the extraordinary importance attributed by Wordsworth to "nature," which for most men signifies simply a more or less agreeable setting for their activities. One of many reasons for this was presumably the poet's association of the out-door world with a view of the universe as not dead but alive—not passive (as inert matter is thought to be) but animated to the last atom by an "active principle." And not merely was nature alive; it was ordered and regular, maturing its "processes by steadfast laws." It was accordingly an "image" of "right reason"—this last a technical term in earlier moral philosophy for the intuitive faculty by which man apprehends the steadfast laws of the moral world. These are but two out of many popular notions which Wordsworth may have absorbed from the cultural atmosphere in which he lived. We cannot suppose that as a child he had a clear apprehension of all the ideas which, even as a man, he did not bring together into a coherent system. But even as a boy of fourteen he could invoke the great names of Religion, Superstition, Science, and Philosophy.

Mr. Havens will forgive the reviewer for making his admirable study an occasion for debate over certain phases of this intricate problem. It is a sure indication of how challenging one reader has found him. For all students of Wordsworth and his age, *The Mind of a Poet* must take its place directly as one among a very small number of indispensable books.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

The University of Minnesota

Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615. By KEATING, L. CLARK. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941. Pp. 172.

These studies deal with six of the best known *salons* of the latter half of the century: those of Jean de Morel, Marguerite de France, Mesdames des Roches, the Villeroys, the Retz's, and Marguerite de Valois; a short section on the Academies of Charles IX and Henri III is also included. All this is introduced by a first chapter entitled *The beginnings of sixteenth-century society* and followed

by an appraisal in the form of a *Conclusion*. According to the foreword, the book was originally a doctoral dissertation and it was brought to publication only after considerable additional study.

Rightly or wrongly, the book gives the impression that in the dissertation the *salons* were treated according to a rather strict historical procedure and that, as an afterthought, it was deemed advisable to link them more vividly with contemporary currents. Again rightly or wrongly, the impression is that this was done by prefacing the specific historical study with a broad design of the spiritual background rather than by blending the two. Whatever may have been the case, the fact remains that Chapter I is too sketchy to justify its inclusion and that Chapters II and III hardly go beyond an enumeration of data, valuable to be sure but largely found in other works. The author's contribution lies mainly in the analysis of the Villeroy and Retz *Albums* (MS. 1663, fonds français, and MS. 24255, ancien fonds français, Bibliothèque Nationale), although this analysis is not free from doubtful discriminations.

To be more specific, the section of Chapter I entitled *French society at the close of the middle ages* (pp. 7-11) owes a great deal to Henri Guy's *Histoire de la poésie française*. Also, in a book designed for scholars, one may ask whether it is worth including a statement such as the following:

But the greatest inspiration of the French nobility in matters social and intellectual, literary and artistic, came from their 'discovery of Italy.' The vainglorious and costly Italian campaigns of Charles VIII, Louis XII, and later those of Francis I, proved a blessing in disguise, for with the returning French armies came an exhalation of the spirit of Renaissance culture already in full bloom on the other side of the Alps.

Regarding Platonism (pp. 14-17), Mr. Keating does not see the distinction between the protection granted to the Platonists by Marguerite de Navarre and the actual Platonic content in her writings; no one questions the former, but the latter is still a moot question.

In Chapter II much of what is said about the Morels, the Dames des Roches, and Marguerite de France unavoidably corresponds with Will's, Diller's, and Peyre's works, as well as various others. For instance, at least five out of fifteen quotations given in connection with the Morels may be found in Will's article (*PMLA* 51: 83-119), and several of the others are acknowledged as being borrowed from Nolhac and Coupé. It is true that in a book of this type not everything can or even should be original, but adequate synthesis requires skillful blending of the component elements. This, Mr. Keating did achieve in the section on Marguerite de Valois, which gives a picture at once documented, vivid, and well written, easily the best in the book.

As regards discrimination, we note on page 119:

One poem in particular shows the strange mingling of religious and profane ideas which characterized the society of the last decade of the century. By this time the sincere piety of a Jean de Morel was gone from society. Gone equally was the mystical Platonism of Marguerite de Navarre, and in their place was a misshapen offspring of both; a repetition of formulae devoid of content.

However, the poem cited is an excellent expression of pure Christian piety and bears no trace of Platonism. On the following page another short piece is qualified as being an "attempted definition of Love in Platonic terms"; but it really is a beautifully clear statement of the ethical meaning of Platonic love.

Most of the *Conclusion* is devoted to linking together the lasting implications of the book, and this is done clearly and effectively. As the very last section, however, we find a three-page discussion of the value of the sixteenth-century *salon* in relation to Madame de Rambouillet and *vice-versa*. Here again, as in some parts of the introductory chapter, we think that the author does not expand sufficiently to prove his point. It is difficult to reconcile the affirmation that "Mme de Rambouillet's achievement was not the invention of a new order, but the return to an order long submerged in oblivion" and that "she insisted on refinement of manner when the leisure classes had slipped to a level of vulgarity and triviality" with the following: "the breadth, width, and depth of social life stand revealed in the politeness, the entertainments, and the serious preoccupations of sixteenth-century drawing-rooms." Aside from the fact that the first sentence is not entirely clear (how far back did this oblivion extend?), the last is negated by the very admission that the influence of the sixteenth-century *salons* had been anything but broad, wide, and deep.

Well coordinated and smoothly written, Mr. Keating's book does fill a gap, and it will continue to do so until the appearance of a "complete treatment," such as is referred to in the foreword. We hope that Mr. Keating himself will see fit to devote to it his extensive erudition and brilliant penmanship.

EDWARD F. MEYLAN

The University of California

Machiavelli, The Prince and Other Works Including Reform in Florence, Castruccio Castracani, On Fortune, Letters, Ten Discourses on Livy. New translations, introduction and notes by ALLAN H. GILBERT. Chicago: Packard and Company, 1941. Pp. ix + 322. \$1.00. (University Classics.)

Professor Gilbert has put together a collection which succeeds better than does any other single English volume in introducing

Machiavelli as a "political thinker and political artist." The interest in the "political artist," the news analyst and political adviser intent on solving immediate problems, justifies the inclusion of the relatively dull *Discourse on Reforming the Government of Florence* along with a selection of personal letters which preserve their sprightliness very well in translation. It accords with Professor Gilbert's interpretation of *The Prince*, his belief that the famous earlier chapters "all look forward to the new prince who shall deliver Italy, chap. 26." In elaborating that interpretation in his footnotes and his introduction, Professor Gilbert goes to extremes in emphasizing the patriotic purposefulness of Machiavelli. To be sure Machiavelli did not think and write for personal advancement only, and Professor Gilbert makes that quite clear. But neither did Machiavelli write for patriotic purposes only. His intelligence ran ahead of any purpose except that of foreseeing what the princes and other politicians were likely to do and what was likely to come of their actions.

The attention paid to Machiavelli's immediate ends affects the style of translation. Professor Gilbert gives precise meanings in English even if the form of the Italian permits vaguer expression. For example, in chapters 15 and 18 of *The Prince*, he translates *salvare lo stato* and *mantenere lo stato* by "preserve his position" and "maintain his government" instead of rendering the passages, as is commonly done, by "save his state," "maintain the state." Professor Gilbert's translation removes an ambiguity which is precisely that inherent in the famous concept of *ragione di stato*. Although Machiavelli's meaning in these particular passages is stated more precisely by Professor Gilbert's rendering, yet in order to make Machiavelli "speak English as clearly as possible," some of the suggestiveness of the original has had to be sacrificed.

FREDERIC C. LANE

The Johns Hopkins University

Ballads and Songs Collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society.

Edited by H. M. BELDEN. University of Missouri Studies XV,
No. 1. Columbia, Mo., 1940. Pp. xviii + 530. \$1.25, unbound.

This most notable collection of American balladry, with its exhaustive apparatus of notes and variants and a twenty-column index, is a distinguished monument of Professor Belden's enduring interest in Missouri folklore. Beginning in 1903, Professor Belden devoted much of his energy and fine scholarship to this subject. The result is this generous volume containing 287 separate texts and many tunes suitably printed on large paper. It may well serve

as a model for other collectors and scholars preparing such materials for publication, although anyone attempting to emulate Professor Belden's wide and profound erudition will have a heavy task on his hands. The categories under which the songs are arranged (p. xii) should be especially useful. I hope that others will not emulate one omission, however, that of a map. The serious user of any local collection of folklore is bound to feel the need of a clearly drawn map. The collector is of course soaked in the lore of his particular region, and therefore he all too frequently fails to include the essential map.

Some of these songs go back in Missouri for more than a century, and they well deserve the expert treatment accorded them. In broadness of scope and in attention to details, as well as in the number of variants given, this collection reminds forcibly of the great edition of the English and Scottish ballads by Francis James Child. The headnotes attempt to list every occurrence of each ballad or song in this country, and copious notes are given also to occurrences in the British Isles. Allusion is made (p. xiii) to the collection of Ozark ballads made by Vance Randolph. "When it is published I believe that the field of folksong in Missouri will have been pretty thoroly covered," observes Professor Belden. Perhaps so; but folklore goes on and on, and no doubt changing times will be reflected in changing folklore, as they have been in the past. Still, the implied wish that Randolph's collection be published will be echoed by all, and along with the congratulations to Professor Belden upon the brilliant publication of his collection, of which students of American ballads have known for years, will go the hope that other materials long held in manuscript, such as the North Carolina collection of Professor Frank C. Brown—to name no others—will see the light before very long.

Slips in the printing are very few. *American Negro Folk-Songs* was edited by Newman I. (not E.) White (p. xiv); Eckstorm and Smyth's *Minstrelsy of Maine* was published in 1927, not 1937 (p. xvi). Singing games, songs of Indian, Negro, French origin, everything has its place in this great treasure-house of American song—everything except a map!

JOHN WEBSTER SPARGO

Northwestern University

BRIEF MENTION

The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson. By W. K. WIMSATT, JR. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 166. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 94.) This is an interesting discourse, rigorous in method but not at all pedantic, theoretical but not too abstract, and remarkably readable. Of course a mere *description* of Johnson's style could not, at this time of day, contain anything new. No other style has been described by so many critics, all of them in substantial agreement one with another. But Mr. Wimsatt's interest has chiefly been to relate its well-known features to a general theory of style. "I find my justification," he says, "a philosophic one"; and he speaks (with more dubious propriety, one may think) of "the general science of verbal style."

The theory that he maintains throughout is that style is nothing but expression—and we recognize here the student of Croce's esthetic. But as he elaborates his argument we become more aware of the hovering presence of Messrs. Ogden and Richards. Thus he defines style as "the last and most detailed elaboration of meaning"; and the title of one of his chapters is *Style as Meaning*. Naturally he is extremely wary of the traditional 'figures of rhetoric,' even of such as are really close to his subject, such as alliteration, antithesis, and balance, and when he uses them does so for the purpose of examining "the expressive tendency that underlies them."

There is no doubt that this theory is philosophically sound, and even acceptable to common sense. Strictness of esthetic theory, however, does not always make for ease and clarity in literary criticism, and it is the particular merit of Mr. Wimsatt's work that he is both easy and clear in his discussion of Johnson's parallelism, his diction, his stylistic antecedents, and so on. On the subject of his generalized, or 'philosophic,' diction he is especially enlightening. It is a kind of "poetry of abstraction," which in its worst phases produces a "monotonous uproar." Mr. Wimsatt ends his study in a light-hearted imitation of this uproar.

MORRIS W. CROLL

Princeton University

Grongar Hill. By JOHN DYER. Edited with Introduction and Notes by RICHARD C. BOYS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 114. \$1.75. Dyer's charming "Grongar Hill" here receives the careful study and the attractive format it deserves. The bibliography and the textual history of the poem are rather

complicated, but Dr. Boys has devised a clear and simple arrangement: he prints in parallel the Pindaric version from Savage's *Miscellany* and the early octosyllabic version from *A New Miscellany*, with notes giving significant variants from other texts, notably those in Lewis's *Miscellany* and the Hertford MS; he then prints the final text from Dyer's *Poems* (1761) and adds a special table of variants to show clearly the order in which the octosyllabic versions were composed and revised. The question of the order of publication is less important. Boys tentatively dates *A New Miscellany* 1726. It may be added that according to the announcements in Wilford's *Monthly Catalogue*, *A New Miscellany* appeared in March, 1726, Lewis's *Miscellany* in July, and Savage's in September. This would put the first known appearance in print of "Grongar Hill" within a month of the first edition of Thomson's *Winter*.

Introductory sections deal briefly but comprehensively with Dyer's life, with the connection between "Grongar Hill" and his other work both in poetry and in painting, and with the reception and reputation of the poem. The tribute to "Grongar Hill" in a set of verses in *Caribbeana* (1741; this piece dated 1734) is an interesting find. Other sources, many of them now unfortunately inaccessible, might take us farther into the underbrush; thus the *British Journal*, October 1, 1726, in a long series of unfavorable comments on Savage's *Miscellany*, uncharitably suggests that "Grongar Hill" is so much superior to the rest of Dyer's work that it must have been revised by Aaron Hill! Such addenda will appear, but meanwhile Boys has given students of the eighteenth century a sound critical edition of an important poem and a most convenient and practical introduction to Dyer's life and work.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

The Rice Institute

CORRESPONDENCE

RENAN ET LUZEL. Mr. Horace S. Craig, Jr., publiant une lettre de Renan à Anatole France dans le N° d'Avril des M. L. N., a présenté comme douteuse sa lecture du nom de la personne qui devait servir de guide à France dans ses courses en Bretagne. Il a hésité entre Luzel et Suzel. C'est bien Luzel qu'il faut lire. Ce nom est familier à tous ceux qui s'intéressent au folklore breton. Né à Ploaret, non loin de Tréguier, archiviste à Quimper, François Marie Luzel consacra sa vie à la recherche des chansons et des contes transmis oralement en Basse-Bretagne. Il a ainsi assuré la conservation d'une soixantaine de mystères et de quatre volumes de *gwerziou* et de *sonnou*.¹ On lui doit aussi *Contes et Légendes des Bretons*

¹ *Gwerziou Breiz-Izel, chants populaires de la Basse-Bretagne* (1868-)

Armoricaains (s. d.), *Contes bretons* (1870), *Traditions orales des Bretons Armoricaains*. *Légendes chrétiennes* (1874), *Veillées bretonnes* (1879), *Contes populaires de Basse-Bretagne* (1887), etc

Luzel fut étroitement associé à la vie de Renan en Bretagne. Il figurait parmi les amis intimes qui avaient leur entrée à Rosmapiamon. Il fut de grand secours à Renan, lorsque celui-ci profitait de ses séjours en Bretagne pour enrichir sa connaissance des légendes celtiques. C'était un homme d'une vaste érudition et d'un charme irrésistible. Le poète et conteur Anatole Le Braz² m'a souvent dit le plaisir qu'il y avait à accompagner, dans ses randonnées, cet enthousiaste sauveteur du passé en quête de nouveaux documents. Luzel n'avait pas son pareil pour délier la langue des paysans bretons. Séduits par ses manières, conteurs et conteuses récitaient devant lui, sans se faire prier, comme devant un des leurs, les histoires qu'on se répète entre gens du pays, pendant les veillées. Renan appréciait lui aussi la valeur de ces érudites promenades, et quand il voulait attirer quelque sien ami en Bretagne, il ne manquait pas de lui laisser entrevoir la possibilité d'excursionner en la compagnie de Luzel. Voici une lettre écrite à Berthelot le chimiste, le 9 août 1885, que l'on peut rapprocher de la lettre à Anatole France:

"Le 18, selon toutes les apparences, je devrai aller à Quimper . . . pour le dîner³ qui doit y avoir lieu cette année. Luzel, Breton tout à fait exquis et, ce qui est rare, d'un grand bon sens, se fait une fête de nous montrer, par ses côtés sérieux et intéressants, Quimper et toute cette côte; puis, avec Luzel, nous verrions tout le Finistère, y compris Morlaix, Saint-Pol-de-Léon, etc. Enfin, de manière ou d'autre, je vous assure que vous ne vous ennuierez pas. Ne remettez donc pas ce voyage. Je vous promets que vous ne vous repentirez pas d'avoir vu le Finistère avec Luzel."⁴

Luzel était né deux ans avant Renan; il ne survécut pas longtemps à son ami: il mourut en 1895.

ALBERT FEUILLERAT

Yale University

WORTINDEX ZU GOETHE'S *Faust* In the April issue of *MLN*, in a review by Professor John A. Walz, the "Wortindex zu Goethes *Faust*" by Hohlfeld, Joos, and Twaddell, receives unstinted praise for its standard of execution, but is categorically condemned in regard to the plan on which it is constructed. The authors, who have commissioned the undersigned to act as their spokesman, beg leave to question the justification for such censure.

The matter at issue concerns the essential significance, in a drama, of

1874). *Sonion Breiz-Izel, chants populaires de la Basse-Bretagne*. Introduction d'Anatole Le Braz (1890).

² Le Braz possédait plusieurs lettres de Renan à Luzel.

³ Il s'agit du Dîner Celtique qui réunissait tous les ans les amis de la Bretagne. Renan présida ce dîner pendant plusieurs années.

⁴ Lettre citée par René d'Ys dans *Ernest Renan en Bretagne*, 326.

what for short we shall call stage directions, tho including in this term also titles of acts or scenes as well as the names identifying the individual speeches. To Professor Walz it is 'wholly unjustifiable' to separate this material from what we designate as *der eigentliche Text* of Goethe's *Faust* or, for that matter, of any literary drama. He asks "What would Goethe's *Faust* look like if it were edited with the omission of all stage directions, titles and names?" In reply we raise the counter-question: "What would Goethe's *Faust* sound like if it were performed with the inclusion of all stage directions, titles and names?" The very words "look like" suggest the printed page, on which the stage directions indeed cannot be dispensed with. The true embodiment, however, of a work of poetry, above all dramatic poetry, is not the printed page, but what comes to life, as it were, for the inner or outer ear and eye of the reader or audience. This, and this alone is the *eigentliche Text* and an *einheitlicher sprachlicher Ablauf* (*einheitlich*, not in reference to any questions of dramatic unity of action, as Professor Walz seems to think, but because uninterrupted by linguistically heterogeneous stage directions). In this vitalization of the words of a dramatic text, stage directions are helpful, often necessary, and significant aspects of the poet's imaginary scene may be conveyed thru them, but they themselves, as language, remain silent. Both linguistically and functionally they operate on a level of their own. To exclude them from an analysis of the creative language of a drama should therefore hardly be called "wholly arbitrary and indefensible." On the contrary, it is a matter of necessity. A glaringly convincing example would be a drama in dialect with its stage directions, of course, in conventional prose. Had we included them in our procedure as an organic part of the drama, as Professor Walz insists we should have done, we should have vitiated our lists or at best have rendered their use difficult and confusing. For this reason we felt, and still feel, justified in claiming that our lists indeed exhibit *das gesamte Wortmaterial* or a *Gesamtschau des Wortschatzes* of Goethe's *Faustdichtung* as a *Sprachkunstwerk*; for a *Gesamtschau* implies not only the inclusion of all that belongs but also the exclusion of all that does not belong.

No doubt, a *Faustwörterbuch*, with which Professor Walz confuses our Index would have to include the vocabulary of the stage directions on the same level as that of the 'dramatic' text. The most, however, that we could have done for them would have been the compilation, in the form of an appendix, of such significant or unusual words or forms as occur in them, but not in the 'dramatic' text. We feel sure no one would expect that the stage directions in their entirety should have been subjected to the same exhaustive word analysis as the rest of the text. Could we have assumed that for reasons of practical convenience (no others we could consider valid) a considerable number of the users of the Index would have favored the addition of such a separate list, we should have been glad to furnish it. It could easily have been done, except perhaps for the question of what to include and what not. Professor Walz e.g. is willing to dispense with the enumeration of "names like Faust, Gretchen and some

others," but he forgets that Margarete occurs about four times as often as Gretchen and that he himself would probably have insisted on an enumeration of the specific occurrences.

Much more of pertinent interest might be said about the stage directions in *Faust*, but limits of time and space forbid. We trust that what we have said will carry conviction that, regardless of whether our plan and procedure are liked or even approved of or not, there is nothing about them that is "arbitrary" or "inconsistent" or "fragmentary." There is only one thing that we might wish to be different. Our search for a concise title has exposed us, with some show of at least mechanical if not essential justice, to the charge of "raising false hopes." We might wish to have forestalled censure on this ground by adding the somewhat awkward subtitle, "*mit Ausschluß der Bühnenanweisungen, Titel und Namen der sprechenden Personen.*" We are making note of it in our memoranda for a second edition.

A. R. HOHLFELD

University of Wisconsin

YET AGAIN THE AGOPARTS. In February 1941 (*Modern Philology*, pp. 243-50) I published an article on Old-French *Agopart* 'Ethiopian' wherein I adhere to a view that *Agopart* represents *Etiopie* ('Ethiopia') plus *-art*, and in April 1942 (*MLN*, pp. 252-59) Professor Leo Spitzer has contributed a study of the same theme wherein he lists under five numbered headings (p. 253) his reasons for considering such an explanation fatally defective. It is interesting to have this new discussion which aims to disassociate *la Agopart* 'the Ethiopians' from *cel d'Etiopie* 'the Ethiopians' in order to derive the name from the verb *agoper* 'to stumble.'¹ I see no need, however, to re-discuss the general bases of my view, but desire merely to add a comment regarding the most concrete of Mr. Spitzer's five objections: his third, in which he points out that as a suffix of nationality *-art* was late in appearing, and in which he states that the *-art* of *Agopart* has a certain pejorative connotation and considers it improbable that such a connotation would attach itself from the start to an *-art* used to indicate nationality.²

¹ See my suggestion in note 13 (p. 249) that the two words were originally independent but became associated in thought, with *Agopart* aiding in a modification in the meaning of *agoper* from 'limp' to 'stumble'; as a gloss to that note let me state that had I ever found any occurrence of an expression *broncher comme un Agopart* ["locution que M. Armstrong doit avoir trouvée": Spitzer, p. 254] I should certainly not have failed to cite the passage.

² When, in this same third heading, Mr. Spitzer cites the statement in my note 9 that the term *Ethiopiens* first appears in the thirteenth century, it is of course a typographical error that accounts for his substitution of seventeenth for thirteenth.

These two assertions are well founded, but they are far from constituting obstacles to the derivation of *Açopart* from *Etiopie*, for there were two terms, each already very frequent in the Crusade period and among the Crusaders, which of themselves were adequate to inspire the formation of *li Açopart* as a semi-pejorative designation of nationality. The first was *li Lombart*. The Lombards, as money-lenders who played an important part in financing the Crusaders, awakened in the Franks not simply normal hostility toward foreigners but the special venom which we reserve for our creditors. It should hardly be offered as an objection that the *-art* of *Lombart* is in no wise a grammatical suffix: the corners of the "vulgar" word *Açopart*, whoever they were, were not philologists. The second term, a pejorative substantive containing the true *-art* suffix and applied to human groups, was *li couart*. The Lombards and the cowards could surely form a husky enough team to bring the *Açoparts* into being.

It may be that were Paul Meyer still with us he would, as Mr. Spitzer (p. 255) hints he might, renege his early view. About that we can not tell, but I feel some confidence that if he were to do so it would not be by reason of the arguments advanced under the third heading.

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

Princeton University

REPLY. I am afraid that the two partners which form Prof. Armstrong's "husky team" are rather ill-matched and unfit for their task: *Lombard*, as Mr. A. admits, is no derivative in *-ard*, nor is *coward* a name of a people. The geographic links between *Lombard* and *Açopart*, as for example a **Venus-ard*, a **Romagn-ard*, a **Grig-ard*, are missing (incidentally, the Italian bankers known as *Lombards* did not establish themselves in France until the 13th cent, cf Marg Zweifel's monograph); missing, too, is the semantic link between 'cowards' and the brave Ethiopian fighters. Thus, with this derivation of *Açopart*, formed with a suffix non-existent in 12th cent France (in that meaning) from a non-existent **Açope* 'Ethiopia'—a derivation, moreover, which fails to take into account the variants extant (*Escopart*—*Achopart*), one may be reminded of a remark of G. Paris in reference to a similar case (*Rom.*, xxiv, 309). Each one of the difficulties of this etymology, alone, might be explained away, but the sum total defies explanation.

L. S.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

NOVEMBER, 1942

Number 7

THIS NUMBER IS DEDICATED

TO

HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

ON

THE OCCASION OF HIS SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

NOVEMBER 10, 1942

AB IGNE IGNEM

THE STYLISTIC INTERPRETATION OF LITERARY TEXTS¹

In order to avoid useless polemic, let us begin by granting that every study which contributes to the better comprehension and interpretation of a literary work is legitimate. Every kind of study is welcome if it adds to our knowledge of a literary work or if it permits us to feel and enjoy it better.

The traditional study of literature has dealt with many important aspects such as the ideologic, historic, folkloric, linguistic, biographic, social, religious; the only thing which had been neglected by traditional criticism is the specifically *poetic* values. Criticism has decided whether a work is of great, average, or scant literary value. But in most instances such evaluation amounts to no more than a faint underlining in a vague system of academic classifications, and, in the best of cases, our great philologists give us rapid, isolated glimpses of the *true* poetic content of the work, without submitting this aspect to a systematic study.

In every poetic production, however (and, of course, I call poetic production not only verse compositions but also every artistically valuable literary creation) the only thing essential—as a poetic production—is its poetic kernel. In the *Quijote* there are represented thoughts, ideas, cultural European currents of the time, national forces and ambitions, a profound personal vision of life; all this could very well have been set forth in the form of a treatise, intellectually ordered and justified—but then it would not constitute a poetic creation. There is also in the *Quijote* a critical portrayal of social life, common wisdom, geographic references, and literary criticism; and all of this could have been presented as topics of information—but then the work would not constitute a poetic creation. And one may go further: it will be readily admitted that if Cervantes had intended primarily to inform us concerning the geography of Spain he would have given us facts in greater quantity, and more precise and better integrated than they appear in the *Quijote*; if he had intended to write a treatise on the cultural ideas which interested him, he would have developed such ideas in

¹ Abridged version of an address made at the 1942 MLA convention at Indianapolis, which may interest the readers of *MLN* (and Professor Lancaster) as a report on one branch of philological activities in Argentina.

greater detail and would have shown us explicitly his own point of view; if he had wished to record the customs and social forces of his time, he would have provided us with more detailed and exact information than is to be found in his work. In short, each one of the aspects of the literary work except the poetic would, if considered as a subject in itself, have turned out better if treated by itself, systematically, and according to its own exigencies. And yet, in this piecemeal, unsystematic and partial form in which these subjects appear in literary master works, their power to vitalize the human heart is incomparably greater. And this is because the power they possess belongs to the poetic architecture in which the social or historic or ideologic themes (the so-called contents) enter as materials of construction. That architecture is of a specific type which *in lato sensu* we call 'artistic' and, in reference to literature, 'poetic'—and the character of which, as such, is revealed in the aesthetic pleasure which is produced in us. Traditional philological criticism methodically studies contents and the value thereof; but is it not also the duty of literary history and of literary criticism to attempt the *methodical* understanding of the poetic in literary works? My two-fold proposition is, first, that the poetical represents not only one but the basic aspect for studies of literary criticism, and, secondly, that it is incumbent upon the new philological discipline, usually called stylistics, to seek out, to appraise, and to rectify the methods suitable for a systematic and rigorous analysis of this aspect of literary works.

Stylistics is style-study. As regards 'style,' this is generally understood to mean an author's particular use of language, his idiomatic mastery and virtuosity, as representing an *additional part* of the literary construction; there have been a number of doctoral dissertations which have attacked the question of style from this point of view. I grant the occasional desirability of such a conception of style; I grant likewise the usefulness of some of these theses as contributions to the study of the style of the authors in question. But the term 'style' has another meaning which is more suitable to the purposes of stylistics: *style is the expressive system of a work, of an author, of an epoch.*

According to this definition stylistics must study the literary work as a poetic structure, taking into account the *two* essential aspects: the manner in which it is constructed, both as a whole and

in its elements, and the sort of aesthetic delight which it produces, in other words the work must be considered both as a created product and as a creating force—as *ἔργον* and as *ἐνέργεια*. Whether the work in question be a small poem, a novel, or a tragedy, the investigator of style seeks to perceive the *modus operandi* of the psychic forces which form the composition of the work, and to penetrate deeper into the aesthetic pleasure which derives from the experience and contemplation of the poetic structure. After that, and only after that, each one of the elements is studied and viewed in its structural rôle within the poetic creation: what does this diminutive express or suggest? how is the rhythm achieved, what does it reveal concerning the act of poetic creation, and what aesthetic effects does it produce? What are the special characteristics of the metaphors, of which elements are they made, and what are the particular procedures of artistic condensation employed by the author?

Stylistics is concerned, then, with the expressive system of a work, an author, or a group of related authors. An expressive system embraces everything from the internal constitution of the work to the suggestive power of the words and the aesthetic efficacy of rhythmical interplay. And by 'internal constitution' I am referring to that world which, in his poem, in his tragedy, or in his novel, the poet shapes out of his sentiments and his thoughts. What is essentially poetic consists precisely of this created structure or architecture; this does not mean, however, that the so-called contents lose their importance for study—indeed these have a qualitative interplay in the form or construction itself. For it is impossible to think of the very same form with different contents; the contents, with their characteristic nature, are formative in themselves.

To clarify this point I should like to adduce an example from another art. In a painting the form or artistic construction is made up of lines and colors and the counterbalance of the two. But these are not the only compositional elements: the construction is made up also of the very materials represented. The wise distribution of cloth, stone, human flesh, vegetable life, sky and water, produces in the painting a harmony of the sensations that are evoked. Notice the formative rôle played by the white and rose-colored tints of feminine flesh against the red and violet velvets; should the pieces of cloth be replaced by other materials of the same color—by stone, for

example, or by vegetation—the composition itself would be thereby altered; that is, the ‘form’ would change. It is well-known that a painting provokes in us not only visual sensations but, particularly, those which are tactile and thermal—as well as various associations of all degrees. These tactile and thermal sensations, these associations, are provoked by the materials depicted (by the contents), thus the contents, with their characteristic material quality, are elements of form. If in a painting an apple is replaced by a clay ball, there will be produced a profound alteration in the harmony of sensations, in the form, even though the clay ball be of the same size, the same form and the same color as the apple. Every work of art is essentially the creation of a structure, of a form; but it is always a structure made up of *something*, a form extracted from *something*. Considered in this way, complementary concepts of matter and form are subordinated to the one all-important concept of form. Our poet likewise creates first and foremost, with his sentiments and his thoughts, a *form*. The thoughts play a rôle in the poetic structure by virtue of their specific qualities; this is why stylistics must study thoughts and ideas as well as feelings. But the former should not be studied *in and for themselves*, as a system rationally justified, but only as expressive elements, as an indirect expression of a deeper ‘thought’ of a poetic nature: an intutional vision of the world and of life, felt, lived, and objectified in the poetic creation.

The great critics of past generations have often dealt with the *Weltanschauung* of a poet whenever the poet (a Dante, a Sophocles, a Cervantes) has been thought to have a world outlook of his own, and his works to possess a philosophical, religious, social or moral content. Knowledge of this sort is a precondition for stylistic studies, but the particular characteristic of stylistic treatment consists in considering the poet’s vision of the world also as a *poetic creation*, as a construction basically aesthetic. It was not Cervantes’ main concern in the *Quijote* to depict the world wherein he had lived, as an ordinary citizen in real life; in his work of art, the vision of the world which is the basis of the life of the citizen Cervantes has been evaluated, sifted and purified; certain tendencies have been emphasized, others subordinated; his own clear vision has given form to the significance of this world; it has become organized, reduced to artistic forms, to an ideal pattern. This

reduction to form belongs to poetic creation. Stylistics, then, interests itself in this creative character of an author's vision of the world, but only with the aesthetico-poetic consequences of this vision—not with its philosophico-rational aspects *in se*. This can be seen most easily in the case of lyrical poems, in which the vision of the world is ordered according not to rational knowledge but to a personal vision of factual elements which have been adapted to the emotional unity of the moment.

Although feeling and sentiment are present in every literary creation they acquire their highest constituent importance in lyric poetry. The emotional attitude which is crystallized in a lyric poem may be derived from real events in the poet's life, as, for example, in the *Coplas por la muerte de su padre* of Jorge Manrique or in the love ballads of Lope de Vega; again, as in the serene poetry of Fray Luis de León, this attitude may be 'achieved' by the poet, as a refuge from the disquieting anxieties with which the world torments him; there may even be a question of a dramatization of sentimental attitudes, as in Espronceda's *Canción del pirata* or the *Romances gitanos* of García Lorca. In all cases, even when an autobiographical basis is present, the poet has shaped and adjusted his sentiment, in the same manner that he has crystallized his vision of the world. The emotion which the poet has experienced in real life may perhaps have been trivial and vulgar; but when his spirit acquires that privileged creative tension which we call inspiration, then there appear in his work of art splendors and forces by which the raw material has been qualitatively transformed and given the universal value of an ideal pattern. And it is with this transfigured sentiment, not with the raw material of emotion, with which stylistics deals; the poem should not be treated as a biographical document nor as a monument of a moral attitude which may have been underlying the original experience.

And here we arrive at the capital point of our subject: since sentiment and personal *Weltanschauung* are communicated in poetry not directly but only by means of the suggestive, evocative procedures employed by the poet, the task of stylistics must be to study the *expressive system* of an author. Thus everything that has an efficacious value for suggestion must be studied and this, not by dissection but by evoking the 'biological' forces at work in the poem. We must seek to discover how the poem developed as an

objective construction, i. e., how the 'form' of the poem developed, and how the original reality has been especially prepared to serve as the expression of the sentimental substance intuited by the poet. Stylistics must also study rational thoughts insofar as these have been transformed into poetry; the particular manner in which fantasy operates in its own inventions; the secret order of the poem underlying its apparent whimsicality; the poet's exploitation of the possibilities of his idiom; the expressive intentions with which he has filled out and renewed common syntactical formulae, the expressive procedure to which he has subjected the meaning of words and phrases. Finally the rhythm must be considered: that is, the aesthetico-suggestive construction to which the poet has subjected the phonetic material, the organic activity developed in actualizing the sounds, the aesthetical organization of the given language.

Of course in every literary creation the essential is always that which the poet has succeeded in creating—not what he may have attempted, and failed, to create; we can interpret only what is contained in the poem before us. This, however, does not mean that it is possible completely to exclude the poet: what meaning could a poem have if one were to pretend that it has not come forth from the spirit of a poet? Every poem is an intentional construction and thus may be understood and enjoyed only if the reader grasps the intention around which the poem has been organized. It is precisely what is objectivized in the poem that allows us to discern this prime intention; by the same token, the reader should not consider any intention which he may know to have existed in the poet's mind but which has not been objectively realized.

The only way to perceive the meaning of a poem is to accept it, and recreate it, word by word, verse by verse, in accordance with its rhythmic imagery: to imagine it, I might say, as the work must have developed, shaped by the intention of a concrete human being. And I am not simply recommending this as one way of reading a poem; I maintain that this is the *only* way possible. Each new reading of a poem carries us, willy-nilly, to the moment of the poetic creation which has been perpetuated in the poem. The expressive system of an author can be understood only as a living functioning process, as an efficacious manifestation of that privileged activity which is called poetic creation. This expressive system of a poem, of an author, of an epoch can be the object of

systematic study; and it is this alone which is deserving of stylistic treatment.

Let us then remove the existing taboo against studying the poetic in poetry; for this last is nothing recondite or *ineffabile*. The poets who have made excursions into criticism (Goethe, Lessing, Coleridge, Sidney, Wordsworth, Juan Ramón Jiménez, T. S. Eliot) have all raised problems which were *poetic*; indeed it has been the poetic aspect of literary works, even when these were dedicated primarily to other ends, with which the great body of English critics has constantly and lovingly dealt, in our own time, there are critics like John Middleton Murray and I. A. Richards who, each in his own way, are seeking and finding the poetic values of literature. This is likewise the way of Croce, Dilthey, Simmel, Santayana and Ortega y Gasset who often couple their historical and philosophical interests with elucidations of the poetic side of literary works.

We philologists, too, and we philologists especially, must cooperate in this search for poetic understanding, but we must do so in our own way: carrying out our studies with a method capable of improvement and progress. We can and we must shape a discipline, a tradition of research, by ever anew rectifying and extending our poetico-literary knowledge, which knowledge will pass to successive investigators. The method which we can develop must be based on our particular professional competence, that is, on our professional knowledge of linguistic phenomena and their values. Our point of departure must be the recognition that, just as each idiomatic expression has a meaning fixed by language, so it has also a complex of suggestive powers, likewise, but not as firmly, fixed by language. The meaning of a word is better established by tradition than is the suggestion emanating from the word, although both are *somewhat* fixed (neither completely so; and both are fixed in a particular manner in each language). To use the phenomenological terminology of Edmund Husserl, an expression is the *sign* of the object signified and an indication (or 'connotation') of all that is implicitly meant by the expression—especially of the complex psychic reality from which this expression is derived. There are, then, two types of contents for words and phrases: signified or denoted, and indicated or connoted. The possibility of stylistic studies is based on the fact that the indicated or connoted content, though not

so firmly fixed as is the signified content, is, nevertheless, far from arbitrary: at least it is oriented in a certain direction by linguistic, and at times by literary and historical, tradition. We already possess some brilliant studies of this aspect of language; the Geneva professor, Charles Bally, is a pioneer in this type of study. The idea of starting from the idiomatic peculiarities of an author in order to make a short-cut to his soul has been set forth, clarified and magnificently exemplified in the works of Karl Vossler, who has been followed by Leo Spitzer, Dámaso Alonso, Ernst Robert Curtius and others; with Albert Thibaudet, too, who excels in literary criticism, the method occasionally follows the same trend: from the external linguistic traits of an author toward his interior being. The philological training of such writers assures the most solid basis for a scholarly handling of the discipline of stylistics.

Instituto de filología
Buenos Aires

AMADO ALONSO

OLD-FRENCH *LE CHIEF D'UNE MONTAGNE*

In the *Roman d'Alexandre* a substantive *chief* qualified by *d'une montagne* or by *de la montagne* occurs three times, all three occurrences being in passages interpolated by Alexandre de Paris.¹ In Branch II 954-69 Emendius, in spite of a grave wound received in the battle of the Greeks with the Gadrans, spurs wrathfully through the "vaucel d'une plaigne" (968) and the duke Betis de Gadres, who had seen the wounding of Emenidus, descends upon him from the 'chief d'une montaigne' (969):

Ireement chevalche le vaucel d'une plaigne,
Et Betys li descent du chief d'une montaigne.

Later on (II 1635-58) when Betis, perturbed by the intervention of Alexander and the main Greek army, retreats through the plains in search of some position better adapted to defensive tactics, he comes to a stop in the "chief d'une montaigne" and orders his army to make a stand (*s'alit*, sbj. of *aloier*) and to close ranks (*s'estraigne*, sbj. of *estraindre*); the Gadrans give battle in the

¹II 969, 1646, 1650. See *The Medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, Vols. II (for the text), IV (for the authorship of the passages in question), V (for the critical apparatus).

"chief de la montagne"; protected by high peaks and precipitous gorges save where their position opens out toward a plain, the best troops post themselves as a rear guard and battle furiously against the pursuing Greeks in the *val de Gunsterain* (1658). The *chief* appears twice in 1646-50:

Li dus s'est arestés *el chief d'une montaigne*
 Et commande a sa gent que s'alit et s'estraigne.
 Tels vait entr'aus joster qui en son sanc se baigne;
 Molt se set bien garder qui ne muert ou mehaigne.
El chief de la montaigne josterent li Gadrain.

The Tobler-Lommatzsch *Worterbuch*, which does not cite these three examples of *chief*, though they are all present in the Michelant text (127, 12; 163, 7; 164, 11), does give (under *chief*, col. 385) an example of *chief de la montaigne* (*Roman de la Rose*, ed. Langlois 6079) and defines the *chief* as 'Spitze,' just as Langlois had defined it in his *Glossaire* as 'sommet,' but the narrative which follows RAHx II 1646-50 shows clearly that the *chief de la montaigne* where Betis posts his army is not a mountain top.² In the context, when the battle has continued for a time and Betis has been unhorsed, he summons his forces to the rescue and the Gadrans come out from the mountains and rally to his aid (1659-1731). The twelve Greek peers thereupon execute a flanking movement, pass between the hostile army and the mountains and seize the defiles, thus cutting the Gadrans off from the possibility of retreat (1732-34). The further fighting ends quickly in the collapse of Betis and his forces and the disorganized flight of the survivors to the city of Gadres (1735-1811).

The natural deduction to be drawn from the above narrative is that the location chosen by Betis for his stand was a 'repli de montagne,' a hollow starting from an open valley in the plains and penetrating up into the mountains, which offer protection against attack from any side except from the outlet where the *repli* opens into a broad valley in the midst of more nearly level territory. The definition 'repli de montagne' also applies to the *chief* in line 969, already mentioned above: Betis can hardly have been perched atop of a mountain while his troops were battling down in the vale, but

² In this connection note that to render the idea 'sommet de montaigne' the normal Old-French expression was *en son un mont* or *en son une montaigne*. See for example the three occurrences of *en sum le munt* in the *Lai des dous amans* of Marie de France (lines 91, 158, 171).

he could readily have been a bit higher up than the open valley and so not too far distant to observe the wounding of Emenidus.

There remains for our consideration the occurrence of *chief* in the only other known passage where it is found in association with *montagne*: the *Roman de la Rose*, line 6079 of the Langlois edition. Here Jean de Meun in describing Fortune's domicile says that high up in the *chief de la montaigne*—on the declivity and not in the plain—Fortune's dwelling slopes downward ever threatened with collapse. The text reads (6079-83):

En haut ou chief de la montaigne,
Ou pendant, non pas en la plaigne,
Menaçant toujourz trebuchance,
Preste de recevoir cheance,
Descent la maison de Fortune.

Here again the location is evidently no mountain top but a 'repli de montagne' with a slope which loses its abruptness when the hollow smooths down and broadens out into a plain. The description of Fortune's house forms part of a passage (5921-6118) where Jean de Meun is not merely imitating but is actually translating a corresponding passage in the *Anticlaudianus* of Alain de Lille.³ The Latin text underlying 6079-83 is as follows:

*Rupis in abrupto suspensa minansque ruinam
Fortune domus in preceps descendit . . .*

The "Fortunae domus in abrupta suspensa" which "in praeceps descendit" serves to confirm that Jean de Meun's *chief de la montaigne* consisted of a rapidly sloping terrain, such as is characteristic of a 'repli de montagne.'

Once we grant that "chief de montagne" means 'repli de montagne,' it is manifest that in this expression the word *chief* is akin to Latin *cavare* and *cavus*. The verb *cavare* lived on in the Old French as *chever*, with stem-accented forms of the type *chieve* (pr. 3 sing.), but *chever* was subjected to rather constant learned influence, so that *caver* is the modern French form and that *chaver* and *caver* are frequent even in early texts. The adjective *cavu*, *cava* should in popular development give *cho* (cf. Prov. *cau*), *chieve*, but the learned *cave* is the only recorded form for the masculine of the

³ *Anticlaudianus*, Book VII, chapter VIII, and Book VIII, chapter I. The passage in question is quoted in full by Langlois in his note to *Rose* 5921-6118).

adjective.⁴ Nor do the dictionaries record a feminine *chieve*, but none the less this feminine exists. In the *Roman d'Alexandre* we find (III 1039-42):

D'eau du ciel pleue contre une henepee
 En une chieve pierre a Zephirus trovee,⁵
 Grant talent a de boire, n'en a goute adesee,
 Ains la geut en son elme, le roi l'a presentee.

Lines 1039-42 go back to Lambert le Tort and form part of an episode where Lambert closely adheres to the text of the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, which has (ed. Kuebler, p. 195): *miles Zephirus inventam mihi in lapide concavo aquam galea pertulit*; this leaves no room for doubt that Lambert's text spoke of 'a hollow stone.' A second example of *chieve*, again in an early text, is to be found in Ivor Arnold's edition of the *Roman de Brut* (lines 7519-20):

Al funz ad dous draguns dormanz
 En dous pierres chieves gesanz,

where for *chieves* the editor is following the spelling of his basic manuscript (P). In sum, there is substantial evidence for early popular developments of the *cavare-cavus-cava* group and for a substantive *chief* 'concauté' as a member of this group. The *chief* 'concauté' may have been built on the stem-accented forms of *chever* or, in case *chieve* adj. fem. had given rise to a *chief* adj. masc., the *chief* 'concauté' may be a substantivized adjective formed on *chief* 'concave.'

The whole Old-French group was subject to the competition of partly or wholly learned forms (*chaver*, *caver*, *cave*) and to the equally strong competition of the French adjective *crués* (*creux*) and verb *cruesser* (*creuser*). The substantive *chief* 'concauté' had an added handicap in its phonetic collision with the substantive

⁴ When von Wartburg (*FEW* II, p. 559) mentions a thirteenth-century hapax *chief* 'caverne' and states that it is derived from *cavu*, he presumably has in mind the *chief* cited in the Tobler-Lommatzsch (II, col. 390), but Charles H. Livingston (*MLN* 54 [1939], pp. 290-91) has shown that the line as there cited is based on a misreading and that the *chief* therein has its commonplace meaning 'tête.'

⁵ The basic manuscript (G) has altered *chieve* to *dure* but D and T, which belong to the same family, have *chieve* and A has *cheva*; FY have *chave*; RPQJK have *cave*; M has *cruese* and L has *Ens u crués d'une roche*; CENH alter. The Italian scribe of B, with *olive pierre*, has seemingly equated the *ch* of *chieve* with *ol*.

chief 'tête,' and the cumulative effect of these three factors fatally destined it to extinction. Thus it need awaken little surprise that no trace has been found of *chief* 'concavité' save in the specialized meaning of a geological concavity and even then only when it is accompanied by a qualifier ("d'une montagne" or "de la montagne") serving as an aid to distinguish it from *chief* 'tête.' This somewhat fragile prop was insufficient to save the "*chief de montagne*" and, so far as at present recorded, the first and last preserved occurrences are the three of Alexandre de Paris and the one of Jean de Meun, all four examples being applied to a gorge or set of gorges penetrating up into a mountain side.

Princeton University

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

GOETHE HISTORIEN LITTÉRAIRE

Sainte-Beuve, on le sait, appelait Goethe "le roi de la critique" (21 octobre 1850) ou "le plus grand des critiques" (12 avril 1858) : cet éloge d'un maître par un autre maître était surtout fondé sur les *Entretiens avec Eckermann*, dont avait été émerveillé l'auteur des *Causeries du Lundi*. Une souplesse infinie d'intelligence se jouant sur un fonds stable de discernement et de goût, nulle prévention pour barrer le chemin à une œuvre nouvelle, la tradition de l'hellénisme assurant seule quelques normes applicables à une variété d'intérêts à peu près parfaite : le sage de Weimar semblait avoir préfiguré l'attitude finale d'un autre critique, "rompu à toutes les métamorphoses" par tant de curiosités suivies de déceptions, par des enthousiasmes variés auxquels avaient succédé d'apparentes apostasies. La formule critique de Sainte-Beuve, "montrer ce qu'un auteur a voulu dire, et comment il l'a dit," avait été proposée *avant la lettre* par Goethe :

Was hat sich der Autor vorgesetzt? Ist dieser Vorsatz vernünftig und verständig? Und wiefern ist es gelungen, ihn auszuführen? ¹

* * *

Or, si l'historien littéraire doit payer, à un immense devancier, un tribut tout semblable, c'est pour des raisons plus complexes, qu'un

¹ W. A., Bd. 42¹, p. 161. Un des traducteurs français d'Eckermann,

livre entier épuiserait à peine : ce livre, s'étonnera-t-on de constater que la bibliographie démesurée de Goethe ne le renferme toujours point ? Ou bien observera-t-on qu'une fois de plus, comme si souvent dans l'histoire de la renommée et de l'action de cet écrivain, ses compatriotes n'ont pas toujours su apercevoir des supériorités que leur cachaient en eux-mêmes d'autres tendances ? La formule "Goethe et Schiller," ou même "Schiller et Goethe," comme disait Nietzsche, a par bonheur été moins opérante en France qu'en Allemagne. Et les vues fort claires de l'auteur de *Poésie et Vérité* en matière d'histoire littéraire ont rejoint ou devancé sans effort celles qui se faisaient jour en France en particulier : d'où des commencements d'enquête auxquels on voudrait ajouter ici.²

Il va de soi que pour Goethe, héritier et "augmentateur" de l'idéologie amorcée par les philosophes grecs, la connaissance des choses par leur *devenir* est la norme même de l'esprit attentif à la réalité. Il suffit de voir par exemple, après 1815 et dans le trouble des temps aussi bien que par ses inquiétudes personnelles, le "sage de Weimar" préoccupé des indices favorables ou contraires à ces vues, et de comprendre à quel point lui tiennent à cœur les

Emile Délerot, m'a encore affirmé, après la publication de mon *Goethe en France*, l'intérêt passionné, et comme personnel, témoigné par Sainte-Beuve au sujet des *Entretiens*. En ce qui concerne le sujet abordé ici, un simple rudiment apparaît dans O. Harnack, *Ueber literarhistorische Methode* dans *Essais und Studien zur Literaturgeschichte* (Braunschweig, 1899), et rien dans E. Menke-Gluckert, *Goethe als Geschichtsphilosoph* . . . (Leipzig, 1907). W. Dilthey dans *Erlebnis und Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1906) ne touche qu'à la partie *biographique* de la question. Inversement, "le passé en général" fait surtout l'objet d'E. Cassirer, *Goethe und die geschichtliche Welt* (Berlin, 1933).

² Cf. I. Rouge, *Goethe critique: l'acheminement à la méthode génétique*, dans *RLO.*, XII (1932), 99, et—intéressant à cause de la jeune personnalité de l'auteur, fils d'un biologiste renommé qui a défini son attitude en matière d'évolution zoologique,—Claude Cuénot, *Une application de la morphologie goethéenne à l'histoire littéraire en Allemagne* (*RLO.*, XIV (1934), 241). Goethe, qui visiblement déplore (42^e, 151) "dass die Deutschen sämtlich transcendiren," se rencontre exactement sur ce point—si nécessaire à la constitution des saines sciences de l'esprit—avec Guizot, qui sera probablement, avant J.-J. Ampère, son préféré des "globistes," et qui écrivait à Fauriel après un séjour à Goettingue, le 24 juin 1811 : "La raison en Allemagne me semble honteuse du peu de succès de ses efforts, et elle se réfugie dans le mysticisme pour échapper au sentiment de son impuissance."

explications "génétiques" des choses, pour saisir l'importance du problème. Que ce soit dans ses conseils à son débile fils Auguste ou dans ses objections à Creuzer et à bien d'autres, un souci permanent se manifeste. "C'est toujours en suivant la genèse des choses, avait-il écrit à Jacobi le 2 janvier 1800, que je suis le mieux parvenu à une vue intuitive." Les créations de l'esprit ou du sens artiste n'échappent en rien à l'application d'une telle méthode, puisque le 4 août 1803 il avait formulé dans une lettre à Zelter la grave vérité qu'il est nécessaire de citer dans le texte, pour mieux la rapprocher de vues semblables exprimées par Pétrarque, par Montaigne, Descartes et bien d'autres :

Natur- und Kunstprodukte lernt man nicht kennen, wenn sie fertig sind: man muss sie im Entstehen aufhaschen, um sie einigermaßen zu begreifen. . . .

"Einigermassen": c'est-à-dire que l'appréciation esthétique doit compléter ce qui, chez un analyste ou un chroniqueur, demeurerait une morne énumération si l'"histoire," en art et en littérature, devait s'en tenir à des juxtapositions de faits, de dates, de noms, et même de sujets, qui ne décident rien d'essentiel, ne considèrent que la matérialité ou l'apparence d'un effort de création, et ne rendent justice qu'à l'accessoire. Ce sont des aide-mémoires que les chronologies qui se donneraient pour des histoires; des bibliographies ne sauraient s'offrir à elles seules comme des présentations historiques. Même la *thématologie*, cette *Stoffgeschichte* dont certains travailleurs ont pu croire que c'était une méthode acceptable pour établir des enchaînements authentiques, ne satisfait pas l'attente d'un lecteur avisé. Preuve en est l'insuffisance d'un ouvrage réputé cependant, les *Conférences* d'A. W. Schlegel sur *l'Art et la Littérature dramatique*. Le 28 mars 1827, Goethe prononce sur cet ouvrage un jugement qui peut s'appliquer à d'autres précieuses et inertes constructions, et Benedetto Croce n'aura qu'à ajouter, dans un article célèbre de la *Critica* (II (1904), 483) son exigence de logicien à la condamnation de Goethe pour déprécier à jamais—du moins le pouvait-on croire—des études de ce type, braquées sur une identité fallacieuse des *sujets* pour passer en réalité à côté des réels problèmes :

Sa critique est complètement unilatérale, parceque dans toutes les pièces examinées Schlegel considère seulement le squelette du sujet traité et sa disposition, en signalant uniquement de menus points de ressemblance avec

de grands prédécesseurs, et sans se préoccuper le moins du monde de ce qu'un auteur peut avoir à manifester de grâce, de vie, des mérites d'esprit d'une grande personnalité.

C'est surtout à propos de Molière, médiocrement rattaché à des "sources" par l'acrimonieux critique, que Goethe inflige rétrospectivement à ce dernier un blâme significatif. C'est que—il l'a dit ailleurs (*Dichtung und Wahrheit*, II, 6)—"une source ne peut se concevoir que coulante," et cette formule prédit trop exactement les prédilections de l'évolution créatrice pour n'être pas saluée au passage : correctif à toute étude folklorique oublieuse des conditions auxquelles sont soumises les fictions traditionnelles ; memento donné à tout historien littéraire qui négligerait la fluidité inévitable des "thèmes" acceptés, transmis, recréés par les collectivités successives.

Si encore la "thématologie" était sure de la continuité de ses illustrations, et de la suite, sans défauts, des textes qu'elle peut alléguer ! Mais Goethe, sachant bien que toute transmission verbale a des "trous," et que la littérature orale en particulier est loin d'être une sorte d'emballage sans défaut, a dépassé les nomenclateurs de son temps par une vue d'avenir, à laquelle l'auteur de ces lignes a demandé l'épigraphe de sa *Littérature*, et qui prend souci d'un phénomène important, quoique négatif en apparence, de l'histoire littéraire : non pas seulement les destructions matérielles d'une part importante des créations de l'esprit, mais les faits courants de simplification, d'unification, d'absorption en des ensembles légendaires, qui obligent, dira Sainte-Beuve, à "briser la glace pour retrouver le courant." A plusieurs reprises, dans le *journal de Makarie* des *Années de voyage*, dans les *Maximes* et dans *Art et Antiquité*, Goethe a insisté sur le caractère normalement fragmentaire des littératures :

Combien peu de chose, de ce qui s'est passé, a été écrit ; combien peu de ce qui a été écrit a été sauvé !

Comme en même temps il raillait les flaireurs d'"emprunts," qui "définiraient aussi bien un Hercule en additionnant les bœufs et moutons qui lui fournirent sa force" (16 décembre 1828), et les "philologues" sans goût qui font des gloses purement verbales et formelles sur les textes (W. A., Bd. 42², 175 ; *Eckermann*, 11 février 1831), mais comme il admettait d'autre part, pour les autres comme pour lui-même, la nécessité d'aider les fonctions

créatrices, son point de vue accepte sans difficulté, vers 1828, celui que l'histoire littéraire, si vivante à ce moment, lui offrait en France: les Fauriel et les Boissonade d'une part, les Sainte-Beuve d'autre part, jetaient en effet les fondements sur lesquels—à part quelques déviations—tout un siècle n'a eu qu'à bâtir, à égale distance de la rhétorique bavarde et de la minutie érudite.

Tandis que l'excès de "transcendance" de ses compatriotes l'inquiète en ces matières, il voit que le défaut français de l'excès logique est en train de céder à plus de *relativité* et de vie. Que ce soit dans ses lectures du *Globe*, ou dans sa découverte personnelle d'un J.-J. Ampère ou d'un A. Stapfer, le weimarien juge en bonne voie la méthode française de l'histoire littéraire. Elle part de l'écrivain dans son individualité, dans sa vérité artistique, conditionne l'oeuvre par l'homme et détermine l'originalité foncière, en quelque sorte *vitale*, d'un auteur qu'influencent ensuite—comme lui-même reconnaît avoir été influencé—les actions de la vie et du monde. Elle ne se laisse pas impressionner par la soi-disant inspiration anonyme qu'animerait l'âme collective chère aux romantiques. "toute poésie individuelle tient d'extrêmement près à ce que nous appelons poésie populaire." La littérature comparée, comme de juste, vient au secours de l'histoire littéraire nationale: non seulement pour des temps propices à la "littérature universelle," mais parce qu'aucune nation ne s'est formée toute seule," et que seule "l'assimilation de trésors étrangers suscite de grandes choses" (Chancelier Müller, 17 décembre 1824).

Même si le "démoniaque" échappe à l'analyse, à l'explication *causale*, à l'étude "génétique," ce résidu n'en sera que plus précieux à l'historien ou au biographe, puisque là sera une sorte de point vital (aussi irréductible que l'*intraduisible* en traduction) inhérent à l'individu, inexplicable par le détail des influences subies et exercées, lequel risquerait de nous égarer en séparant à l'excès la cause et l'effet, alors que le phénomène est immédiat et un. . . .

* * *

Etendues à des "périodes," l'histoire littéraire selon Goethe souffrait évidemment de quelque subjectivité, lorsque dans *Poésie et Vérité* il caractérisait les *dominantes* des lettres allemandes du XVIII^e siècle, ou lorsque, dans des *Etudes sur la Littérature universelle*, il cherchait les épithètes les plus propres à en définir les

périodes 1750-70, 1790-1810, 1810-20: il semble que la lecture de Villemain et de Guizot ait révélé à cet individualiste la complexité du XVIII^e siècle et de sa civilisation. En tout cas, il s'est toujours gardé du périlleux sophisme qui verrait un "développement" autonome, "du dedans au dehors," dans des phénomènes aussi complexes: une collectivité est amenée à manifester ses "potentialités" sous des influences intellectuelles qui peuvent aller du plagiat et de la servile imitation à l'émancipation, de l'action des grandes personnalités à un progrès moyen des goûts et des lumières.

Méritoire curiosité, chez l'historien, que la détermination de tout cela! Et quelle absurdité de prétendre placer l'activité de l'enquêteur habile du passé au-dessous de celle de l'artiste dit *créateur*! On croit entendre Emile Zola ne voyant pas de différence essentielle entre Balzac extrayant d'une société actuelle ses linéaments organiques et Taine (sauf pour l'a *priorisme* de telles de ses vues) faisant de même pour des ensembles du passé, lorsqu'on réfléchit à la boutade de Goethe, attribuant "sa couronne propre" à l'historien aussi bien qu'au poète, engagés dans une compétition "aussi méritoire quoique aussi différente que celle du coureur et celle du boxeur." (W. A. Bd. 42^e, 144.)

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

University of California, Los Angeles

LA PALABRA "TÍTERE"

Los diccionarios etimológicos nada dicen acerca de este vocablo, usual en español y portugués, y que no creo se haya escrito antes del siglo XVII: "Mi bisavuelo tuvo *títeres* en Sevilla, los más bien vestidos y acomodados de retablo que jamás entraron en aquel pueblo. Era pequeño, no mayor que del codo a la mano, que de él a sus títeres sólo había diferencia de hablar por cerbatana o sin ella. . . . Dava tanto gusto el verle hazer la arenga titerera, que por oírle se ivan desvalidas tras él fruterías, castañeras y turróneras."¹ El *Tesoro* de Covarrubias, 1611, consigna interesantes datos, *s. v. retablo* y *títtere*: "Algunos *extrangeros* suelen traer una caxa de títeres, que representa alguna *historia sagrada*, y de allí les dieron el nombre de retablos." "Títeres, ciertas figurillas que

¹ *Pícara Justina*, 1605, edic. Puyol, I, 80.

suelen traer *extrangeros* en unos retablos, que, mostrando tan solamente el cuerpo dellos, los gobiernan como si ellos mismos se moviesen; y los maestros que están dentro, detrás de un repostero y del castillo que tienen de madera, están silvando con unos pitos, que parece hablar las mismas figuras." En 1613 trata Cervantes por vez primera de nuestros muñecos animados en *El licenciado Vidriera*:² "De los titereros decía mil males: decía que era gente vagamunda y que trataba con indecencia de las cosas divinas, porque con las figuras que mostraban en sus retablos volvían la devoción en risa, y que les acontecía envasar en un costal todas o las más figuras del Testamento Viejo y Nuevo, y sentarse sobre él a beber en los bodegones y tabernas, en resolución, decía que se maravillaba de cómo quien podía, no los ponía perpetuo silencio en sus retablos, o los desterraba del reino."

Cervantes aprovecha los títeres para insistir una vez más sobre la distinción entre lo divino y lo humano, categorías tan mezcladas y confundidas en el arte de su tiempo; sus razones parecen anticipar algunas de Don Nicolás Ferrández de Moratín en sus *Desengaños al teatro español* (1763), obra que tanto contribuyó a que dejaran de representarse los autos sacramentales.^{2a} Pero lo que inmortalizó a las insignificantes figurillas fué el papel que desempeñan en el "retablo de Maese Pedro" (*Quijote*, 1615, II, 25): "Este es un famoso titerero, que ha muchos días que anda por esta Mancha de Aragón." Aquel mismo año habla también de los títeres Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa (*Plaza universal de todas las ciencias*, 1615, discurso xcii): "No es razón se olviden otros *extrangeros* manejadores de títeres, ministros de particular entretenimiento, a quien hazen dezir y hazer lo que quieren, metiéndolos en campaña, donde peleando se vencen unos a otros; industrias todas, antes ganzúas generales para las bolsas."

Esos primeros años del siglo XVII fueron, a juzgar por los ante-

² Edic. "Clásicos Castellanos," t. 36, pág. 63.

^{2a} Los autos sacramentales fueron prohibidos en 1765 por Carlos III, y en la Real Cédula dada al efecto se dice: "Deben prohibirse por ser los teatros lugares muy improprios y los comediantes instrumentos indignos, desproporcionados para representar los sagrados misterios de que tratan" (Ap. E. Cotarelo, *Iriarte y su tiempo*, pág. 47). El poder público había tardado ciento cincuenta años en ponerse a tono con las opiniones de Cervantes acerca de la mezcla indebida de lo sagrado y lo profano, perfectamente normal para los contemporáneos de Cervantes, pero no para él.

riores textos, el momento de novedad y apogeo para los muñequitos actores. Son también los años en que la comedia inaugurada por Lope de Vega llegaba al auge de su popularidad, cuando a los modos del vivir exaltado se sustituye la vivencia de sus representaciones. Vivir comienza a ser un "como si" se viviera; y ese choque entre los anhelos y la no posesión de las realidades es lo que tensa prodigiosamente el conflicto vital de la comedia. Buena sazón para hacer su agosto los titereros venidos de más allá del Pirineo, junto con los amoladores de cuchillos y tijeras, y los buhoneros cargados de fuelles, ratoneras, peines y alfileres,³ que trocaban su técnica por el oro mágico venido de las Indias. Técnica para el vivir práctico, y técnica para dejar volar el ensueño.

Ya se ha visto que algunos de los textos anteriores notan los títeres como importación extranjera, y se refieren al carácter religioso de sus representaciones ("historia sagrada," Covarrubias; "figuras del Testamento Viejo y Nuevo," Cervantes). Pues bien, *títere* es el francés *titre*, fr. ant. *titele*, lat. *titulum*, en el sentido especial de 'iglesia, monumento.'⁴ Tan gran salto semántico requiere alguna explicación.

El francés moderno ha olvidado el sentido antiguo de *titre*, que todavía era normal para Calvino: "Le Seigneur non seulement a deffendu de forger des statues pour le figurer: mais aussi de consacrer *titres* ou pierres, où on feist révérence."⁵

Antes se encuentra el mismo vocablo en una traducción de la Biblia de fines del siglo XIII: "Absalon a son vivant avoit drecié un *titele* en la valee roial en l'onneur de son nom."⁶

³ Quevedo, *La hora de todos*, xxxi

⁴ "Apud scriptores ecclesiasticos sunt oratoria, vel aedes sacrae, quibus presbyter aliquis assignabatur ad sacra peragenda" (Forcellini). En inscripciones *titulus* vale a veces 'sepulcro,' acepción derivada de *titulus sepulchri* 'epitafio.'

⁵ *Institution de la religion chrétienne*, edic. de 1541, en el fascículo 176 de la "Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes," pág. 132. El texto latino (edic. de 1539) dice: "Hac ratione, Dominus non statuas modo erigi ad se effigiandum fabrefactas, sed *titulos* etiam quoslibet et lapides consecrare vetuit" (*Inst. Relig. Christ.*, III, 29 en "Corpus Reformatorum," vol. xxix).

⁶ *Regum* II, xviii, 18, en Guiart Desmoulins, Bible, apud Godefroy. El texto de la Vulgata es: "Absalom erexerat sibi, cum adhuc viveret, *titulum* qui est in valle regis." La Biblia de C. de Valera tradujo "columna."

El nombre se generalizó, y fué aplicado al templo, al monumento, al "castillo" como dice Covarrubias, en que ocurrían las peripecias de los muñecos, que debieron tener carácter religioso antes que profano. El teatro de figurillas, lo mismo que el de los actores de carne y hueso, fué primeramente religioso. Es lo que descubre el proceso semántico del fr. *marionnette*, en fr. ant. *mariotte*, *mariole* 'imagen de la Virgen María, persona que la representaba.' *Marionnette* es diminutivo de *Marion*.

No poseo texto francés que demuestre que *titre* se aplicó al teatro de "marionnettes," pero el hecho de la adopción de la palabra en España lo hace evidente. Es muy probable que tal vocablo, lo mismo que el objeto que designaba, tuviese vida sólo popular. Con todo, incluso con textos franceses puede también sostenerse que *titre* se refería al arte escénico, porque Godefroy menciona la acepción de "farsa." o sea 'representación cómica':

"Au dieu Bacchus ne levez les pupitres ['tablados']
Pour deschanter tragedies et *titres*"^a

El texto de las *Geórgicas* a que se refiere ese pasaje es: "et ueteres ineunt proscaenia ludi," 'se llevan a la escena los antiguos espectáculos,' es decir, los himnos a Baco, origen tanto de la tragedia como de la comedia.

La palabra española designó, por consiguiente, el teatrillo ambulante, y luego los muñecos actores. *Titere* puede ser o pronunciación francesa arcaica conservada dialectalmente (comp. *titele*), o simple desarrollo de *titre*. Sea como fuere, *titre* 'teatro de muñecos,' pertenecería a la lengua más baja, que dejó tantos reflejos en español, cuya tierra desde antiguo estuvo invadida por peregrinos, vagabundos y truhanes de toda laya, atraídos por Santiago de Compostela.⁹ Al parecer, fr. *titre* 'teatro de muñecos' no fué

^a "*Mariolae* dicebantur sacerdotes vel clerici, qui die sancto Paschae trium Mariarum personas agebant," en el *Glossarium* de Du Cange, que cita este texto: "Interim in revestuario parantur tres Mariolae, quarum duae indutae sunt casulis albis, et tertia dalmatica alba, coopertis capitibus amictu, tenentes in manibus poma aurea in signum aromatum."

⁹ Guillaume Michel, *Deuxième livre des Géorgiques*, en "Oeuvres de Virgile," edic. de 1529.

¹⁰ V. mis *Glosarios latino-españoles*, pág. 389. Aun en 1614 el jesuita Pedro de Guzmán escribe en los *Bienes del honesto trabajo y daños de la ociosidad*, que más de sesenta mil peregrinos entraban en el reino al cabo del año; aunque tal cifra fuese exagerada, su número debía ser muy

usado por la lengua escrita, que prefirió *marionnettes* en el siglo XVI, como se ve en un pasaje de *Les Serées* de Guillaume Bouchet (1526-1606):¹⁰ "On trouvoit toujours aux badineries, bateleries et *marionnettes*, Tabary, Jean des Vignes,¹¹ et Franc à tripe toujours boiteux, et le badin ès farces de France, etc." El primer ejemplo de *marionnette* en el *Dictionnaire Général* es de 1517.

En suma, *títtere* fué primero 'retablo de muñecos,' luego el muñeco mismo. En medios aldeanos y rurales, *títeres* vino a significar cualquier diversión pública consistente en ejercicios de circo: volatines, acróbatas, etc. Realmente hoy *títtere* es sólo sinónimo de "botarate," o sea 'persona frívola e irresponsable.' El antiguo *títerero* ha sido sustituido por *titiritero* por haberse cruzado con *titirimundi* 'cosmorama portátil, figuras de movimiento exhibidas en un cajón,' es decir algo parecido a los antiguos retablos de muñecos. Pero a su vez *titirimundi* es cruce de *tuttilimondi* (ital. tutti li mondi) con *títtere*.

En cuanto al antiguo retablo de títeres, su nombre literario ha variado según la influencia italiana o francesa que haya prevalecido; y en la lengua popular tiene nombres regionales no usados en la lengua escrita, entre los que sólo recuerdo ahora el de "cristobica" en Granada, "os cristobos" en Galicia, porque Don Cristóbal es el personaje principal de la función. Federico García Lorca ha dado fijeza literaria al tema del retablo popular en su "Retablillo de Don Cristóbal. Farsa para guiñol."¹² Se ve que para García Lorca la palabra literaria era *guiñol* (fr. guignol); antes lo fué *polichinela*, aun usado, lo mismo que *fantoche*, ambos extranjerismos.

El español literario, por consiguiente, no tuvo nunca palabra propia para el teatro de muñecos. *Títtere*, de origen francés, es como

crecido. La vida y el lenguaje de la ralea española debió recibir mucho influjo gálico: *bigardo*, *belitre*, *gallofo*, *jaque*, *jerigonza*, *pícaro*, *truhán*. Ahora añadimos *títeres*.

¹⁰ *Les Serées*, edic. 1874, III, 177, ap. H. Clouzot, *L'ancien théâtre en Poitou*, 1901, pág. 284.

¹¹ Aun se menciona en Andalucía a "Juan de las Viñas," sin duda supervivencia de aquel personaje de retablo. L. Montoto y Rautenstrauch lo describe así en *Personas, personajes y personillas, que corren por las tierras de ambas Castillas*, Sevilla, 1911, II, 63: "Dícese del hombre ridículo y estrafalario, a quien todos traen y llevan como si fuera un pelele, y de quien todos se burlan." He visto citado a Juan de las Viñas en obras del siglo XVII, pero no recuerdo dónde.

¹² *Obras Completas*, Buenos Aires, 1938, vol. I, pág. 191.

un resto de remotas influencias medioevales. Desde el siglo XVI comenzaron a prevalecer los vocablos italianos referentes a diversiones públicas a base de la persona humana y sus habilidades físicas: *saltimbanqui*, *volatin*,¹³ *payaso*; más tarde, los circos en España fueron importación extranjera, lo mismo que antes lo fué la escenografía, inaugurada en realidad por el italiano Cosme Lotti, ingeniero florentino que en el siglo XVII ideó trazas y tramoyas escénicas. *Tramoya* es el ital. *tramòggia*. El extranjerismo de todos estos y otros vocablos afines confirma lo que ya se sabe: la escasa aptitud española para la técnica, y su falta de gusto para aquellos ejercicios en que la persona humana se convierte en el espectáculo o en el hazmereir de los demás. El español representa su propio papel en la vida, a veces noblemente, a veces en forma excesiva y hasta ridícula; pero no representa bien el "papel" de otro. De ahí que el teatro español haya sido siempre pobre en grandes actores, y ni aun posea un canon escénico para la técnica de la representación, como un arte culto y consagrado por maneras tradicionales. La gente de lengua española posee hoy escasísimos grandes actores, en el drama, en la ópera o en el cinematógrafo. La ópera ni siquiera puede cantarse en español. Los "anunciadores" de la radio en los países hispánicos no se expresan casi nunca correcta y naturalmente. En el siglo XVII causa profunda sorpresa el contraste entre la riqueza creadora de Lope de Vega y sus sucesores, y la falta de interés y de originalidad para inventar y aplicar formas adecuadas de representación. La historia de las palabras lleva siempre,—debiera llevar siempre,—a contemplar tras ellas aspectos esenciales de la historia humana.

AMÉRICO CASTRO

Princeton University

NOTES SUR UNE PENSÉE DE PASCAL

"*Mien, tien*. Ce chien est à moi, disaient ces pauvres enfants; c'est là ma place au soleil.—Voilà le commencement et l'image de l'usurpation de toute la terre." (*Pensées*, éd. Brunschvicg, n° 295). Ces quelques lignes de Pascal ont déjà suscité bien des discussions et semblent avoir considérablement embarrassé la plupart de ses éditeurs. Certains ont fait preuve d'une ingéniosité extra-

ordinaire pour absoudre Pascal d'un " radicalisme " bien imaginaire ; d'autres ont simplement avoué leur gêne extrême. Il est fort à craindre qu'ils n'aient tous justifié une pensée de leur auteur : " Pourquoi on aime mieux la chasse que la prise. " Après s'être lancé sur une fausse piste, ils ont pris le leurre pour la proie. Il est temps de revenir au texte, de le considérer en lui-même et d'essayer d'en pénétrer le sens en le replaçant dans son milieu et dans son cadre exacts.

Résumant la question, ou plutôt la confusion, M. Léon Brunschvicg avoue son inquiétude :

Le texte de cette pensée est assez incohérent : cela paraît tenir, d'après l'examen du manuscrit, à ce que Pascal aurait en écrivant ajouté à sa première phrase *ce chien est à moi*, qui était d'abord suivie de celle-ci : *voilà le commencement*, un second membre : *c'est là ma place au soleil*. L'incohérence disparaîtrait si on substituait au mot *chien* le mot *coin* ; mais l'auteur de cette très ingénieuse conjecture, M. Salomon Reinach, a le premier reconnu qu'en l'état du manuscrit l'éditeur de Pascal n'avait pas le droit d'opérer une telle substitution."

Nous l'avons échappé belle ! Encore un peu, et nous aurions eu un Pascal corrigé et amendé par Salomon Reinach. Par malheur, l'auteur des *Pensées* ne semble avoir songé ni à Salomon Reinach, ni à M. Brunschvicg, ni aux nombreux commentateurs qui devaient pâlir sur son texte. S'il a pensé à ses lecteurs, c'est pour les prévenir avec une désinvolture où l'on retrouve l'ami du chevalier de Méré : " J'écrirai ici mes pensées sans ordre, et non pas peut-être dans une confusion sans dessein ; c'est le véritable ordre, et qui marquera toujours mon objet par le désordre même. " (Brunschvicg, n° 373.)

En fait, il n'y a ni incohérence, ni contradiction dans ces quelques lignes, mais simplement juxtaposition de deux petites scènes empruntées à la vie, deux vignettes, ou pour emprunter le mot de Pascal, deux " images, " illustrant la pensée elle-même. Pascal, ce contemplatif et ce mystique, n'a été ni un reclus, ni un solitaire. Il aimait à se mêler au petit peuple et ne dédaignait pas de s'arrêter pour voir passer le cortège des magistrats se rendant à la cour, le roi allant à Notre-Dame ou le défilé du régiment des Suisses de la garde. Il n'aurait pu, en tout cas, sortir de sa maison sans avoir sous les yeux le spectacle de Paris, et nous savons combien de tableautins, souvenirs de flâneries dans la grande ville, sont semés en abondance dans les *Pensées*. " Un homme se met à sa fenêtre pour voir les passants " (Brunschvicg, n° 323) ; " Le bec du

perroquet qu'il essuie, quoiqu'il soit net" (B., n° 343); "Le chancelier est grave et revêtu d'ornements" (B., n° 307); "*Talon de soulier*.—Oh! que cela est bien tourné!" (B., n° 117). Il serait facile de multiplier ces exemples et d'ajouter encore aux listes dressées par M. Charles Droulers dans son livre pittoresque sur *La Cité de Pascal* (Paris, 1928). Ici même, il est facile d'imaginer Pascal, au détour d'une rue étroite et sombre, observant une bande de gamins de Paris se querellant autour d'un malheureux chien perdu, peut-être pour le torturer ou aller le noyer, et commençant à réfléchir sur l'origine de la propriété. Au moment même où il se met à écrire, un autre souvenir lui revient à l'esprit: deux pauvres hères se disputant au coin d'une ruelle la flaque de lumière et de soleil où ils pourront se réchauffer, ou encore, plus probablement, un mendiant, sous le porche d'une église, défendant contre un nouveau venu la place devenue sienne, par droit du premier occupant et par une longue possession.

L'emploi du mot "usurpation" lui-même pourrait d'ailleurs appeler quelques réserves. Il n'est pas certain qu'il ait toujours eu au dix-septième siècle un sens aussi fort que de nos jours. On pourrait aisément y voir un souvenir du sens courant latin, "prendre possession par l'usage," devenu "prendre possession contrairement à la loi," chez les juristes seuls. Cayrou, dans son *Lexique de la langue du dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1923), cite Furetière qui donne comme sens déjà vieilli d'usurper, "employer, en matière de mots et de phrases." Cayrou ajoute en note: "Il tient ce sens favorable du latin *usurpare* (contraction de *usu rapere*), 'prendre en se servant,' 'faire usage de, se servir de.'" *Usurper des mots* = 'employer' (attesté par Littré p. ex. chez Calvin) évidemment reflète le latin *usurpare vocem* = *nuncupare* (Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étym.*). On trouve encore chez Montesquieu un curieux exemple de cette bivalence:

Il y avait un homme qui possédoit un champ assez fertile, qu'il cultivait avec grand soin: deux de ses voisins s'unirent ensemble, le chassèrent de sa maison, occupèrent son champ; ils firent entre eux une union pour se défendre contre tous ceux qui voudroient l'usurper; et effectivement ils se soutinrent par-là pendant plusieurs mois (*Lettres Persanes*, XI).

Il serait difficile ici de donner à "usurper" son sens moderne courant, puisque les deux occupants n'avaient en droit aucun titre au terrain dont ils avaient dépouillé leur voisin. Le sens peut être, tout au plus, s'emparer par la force, et il paraît en tout cas

synonyme de "occuper," qui est employé dans la même phrase. Je n'aurais point donné cette indication, si un récent commentateur de Pascal, M. Charles Droulens (*op. cit.* p. 89) n'avait trouvé "usurpation un peu dur," et n'avait ajouté "nous avons déjà remarqué cette propension de Pascal à forcer parfois les mots." En fait, ici, il ne faut accuser que l'usage moderne qui a intensifié et restreint le sens maintenant courant, mais encore un peu flottant au dix-huitième, et à plus forte raison au moment où Pascal écrivait. Si cette explication était admise, la pensée de Pascal perdrait beaucoup de cette hardiesse qui a troublé tant de ses commentateurs dont il nous faut maintenant examiner les scrupules et les hésitations.

Il ne semble pas qu'avant Chateaubriand cette théorie pascalienne de "l'usurpation de toute la terre" ait particulièrement attiré l'attention. Mais quand dans le *Géne* (Troisième partie, liv. II, ch. VI) Chateaubriand entreprit de prouver qu'il n'y avait point d'idée si avancée qu'elle fût, qui n'eût été déjà exprimée par les penseurs et moralistes du dix-septième siècle, il trouva là une splendide occasion de faire un rapprochement qui lui semblait s'imposer :

Une des choses les plus fortes que Rousseau ait hasardées en politique, se lit dans le Discours sur l'inégalité des conditions : "Le premier, dit-il, qui, ayant enclos un terrain, s'avisa de dire : *Ceci est à moi*, fut le vrai fondateur de la société civile." Or, c'est presque mot pour mot l'effrayante idée que le solitaire de Port-Royal exprime avec une toute autre énergie : "*Ce chien est à moi. . .*" Et voilà une de ces pensées qui font trembler pour Pascal. Que ne fût point devenu ce grand homme, s'il n'avoit été chrétien !

Si Chateaubriand a rendu un grand service aux études pascalienues en signalant le premier l'angoisse déjà toute moderne du tourment de l'infini, cette fois il a été moins heureux et s'est indéniablement et majestueusement fourvoyé. En bonne critique, comme en bonne justice, il est désirable d'éviter les lois ou les accusations rétroactives. Dans son horreur pour le babouvisme récent, Chateaubriand rend Jean-Jacques responsable d'un mouvement qui remonte en fait au *Code de la Nature* de Morelly, faussement attribué par Babeuf et ses amis à Diderot, alors que Rousseau n'avait fait qu'exprimer un simple lieu commun de droit civil. De même, il rend Pascal responsable de la trop fameuse phrase de Rousseau. Il est fort dommage qu'il ne soit pas remonté plus haut, car, nous le verrons plus loin, c'est ici ou jamais le cas de remonter au déluge.

Ernest Havet, donnant son édition des *Pensées* au lendemain de la Révolution de 1848 (1852), la revisant après la Commune de 1871, partagé entre son admiration pour Pascal et son horreur du communisme, a augmenté de toute son autorité la confusion créée par l'auteur du *Génie*. En ce sens, la note qu'il a écrite pour le "Fragment 50" de l'article VI est un modèle du genre. En voici les parties essentielles, dont nous retranchons la citation de Chateaubriand et celle du texte de Rousseau :

L'effrayante hardiesse de cette pensée a été relevée par l'auteur du *Génie du Christianisme* dans le chapitre sur Pascal. Il a raison de dire que Rousseau, en s'en inspirant, ne l'a pas égalée. . . . Rousseau fait bien moins peur, en criant et en s'agitant, que Pascal dans son analyse froide et méprisante. L'un s'indigne contre l'usurpation et la menace, il appelle sur ceux qui possèdent toutes les colères qui ont si fort éclaté depuis; l'autre n'a point de colère contre les possesseurs, il ne les voit pas, il ne voit que ces pauvres enfants qu'il prend en pitié. . . . On se demande comment les éditeurs de P. R. ont osé conserver un tel passage; n'en auraient-ils pas compris toute la portée, que nous sentons si bien aujourd'hui? Cependant ne nous troublons pas: des esprits bien lumineux ont porté du jour dans ces ténèbres où le *tien* et le *mien* ont leurs origines; ils ont montré que l'homme s'approprie les choses en mettant dans les choses une part de lui-même qui les fait siennes, son activité libre et son travail. Oui, ce chien peut être à cet enfant, si cet enfant s'est fait suivre de ce chien, s'il l'a apprivoisé et dressé. Cette place au soleil sera bien sa place, si c'est lui qui l'a trouvée, ménagée, rendue commode, ou si ses camarades la lui déferent un jour qu'il se sera battu pour eux. Ce n'est pas dans une note que nous pouvons creuser ces problèmes; mais tant qu'on dira *toi* et *moi*, nous croyons qu'il faudra dire aussi *tien* et *mien*. Qui veut supprimer la propriété devra supprimer la personne.

Il n'est pas besoin de reprendre dans le détail cette argumentation dans laquelle Havet, se plaçant à un point de vue tout contemporain [*aujourd'hui*], ne se demande même plus ce que Pascal a voulu dire, et, encore moins, ce qu'ont pu dire ou faire "ces pauvres enfants." Il apparaît, sans autre démonstration, que l'éditeur a bâti de toutes pièces un petit roman sociologique, tant était grand son désir, louable mais portant à faux, d'atténuer les conséquences désastreuses que pourrait avoir pour la société de son temps la théorie que gratuitement il prête à Pascal.

Arrivons maintenant à M. Léon Brunschvicg qui est allé un peu plus loin et dont l'analyse est moins imagée, mais presque aussi fantaisiste:

Quant au fond, Chateaubriand y a vu avec raison le germe des idées développées par Rousseau dans le *Discours sur l'inégalité des conditions*

humaines (sic.) . . . Mais il faut prendre garde aussi que ce rapprochement ne nous entraîne à forcer la pensée de Pascal. Rousseau s'indigne contre une injustice préméditée; Pascal, avec plus de profondeur sans doute, constate une nécessité sociale; pour lui la propriété n'est pas de droit absolu, mais elle est liée inévitablement à la condition humaine, puisque les plus misérables commettent cette "usurpation" de vivre et d'avoir leur place au soleil; elle naît spontanément par le développement spontané de la société humaine, et c'est là, comme Pascal le montre dans les pensées qui suivent, le plus solide fondement qu'on puisse invoquer en sa faveur. Il est à noter que cette pensée figure dans l'édition de Port-Royal.

Malgré cet essai de justification, la gêne de l'éditeur est évidente. Une fois de plus, on attribue arbitrairement à Pascal une théorie qu'il n'a nulle part exprimée ni même indiquée. Plus récemment, M. Victor Giraud, qui connaît admirablement à la fois Pascal et Chateaubriand, se bornait à reproduire sans commentaire rectificatif le trop fameux passage du *Génie* (Pascal, *Œuvres choisies*, Paris, 1931). Quant à M. Jacques Chevalier, dont le *Pascal* a paru en 1922, peu après la guerre, il a cru devoir indiquer que "*cette place au soleil* dont les Allemands ont fait un curieux instrument de propagande et ce *tiers indifférent* [allusion à la pensée suivante] qui pose le principe de la Société des nations, sont peut-être parmi toutes les vues de Pascal, celles qui ont le plus frappé les étrangers, notamment en Amérique. Je pourrais citer, à l'appui de ce dire, de bien curieux témoignages" (p. 235). Il est fort regrettable qu'il ne l'ait point fait. Il aurait été intéressant de connaître les noms de ces pascaliens d'Amérique.

La cause serait jugée depuis longtemps et le malaise se serait dissipé, si les éditeurs des *Pensées* s'étaient préoccupés tout d'abord de rechercher les antécédents des idées de Pascal sur le *tien* et le *mien* et s'ils les avaient rapprochées des opinions contemporaines. Ils auraient pu constater que l'inclusion dans l'édition de Port-Royal de la pensée sur le *mien* et le *tien* n'avait rien de révolutionnaire ni d'étonnant. Par contre, ils auraient pu remarquer que cette pensée a été éliminée de l'édition donnée au dix-huitième siècle par Condorcet, et cette omission n'est pas moins significative que cette inclusion. C'est que, sous l'influence de Locke d'abord et ensuite des Physiocrates, les idées sur l'origine et l'importance du droit de propriété s'étaient singulièrement précisées et avaient pris une force extraordinaire. Mais les Messieurs de Port-Royal, Pascal et encore plus les juristes de son temps auraient été fort étonnés s'ils avaient pu prévoir qu'un jour, en somme assez proche, la propriété serait

comptée au nombre des "droits naturels." A ce propos, il n'est peut-être pas inutile de faire remarquer que la propriété n'est pas comprise dans l'énumération donnée par Jefferson, Adams et Franklin dans la Déclaration d'Indépendance, et qu'en agissant ainsi, les rédacteurs de la Déclaration ne faisaient que suivre Blackstone, qui avait déclaré qu'au point de vue du droit naturel, on ne pouvait justifier l'origine de la propriété.

Sans vouloir refaire ici, ni même esquisser une histoire du droit de propriété, sans remonter à Cicéron, à Saint Augustin, à Saint Thomas, ni même à Grotius, on peut au moins se reporter à un juriste français, ami de Pascal et par surcroît étroitement lié à Port-Royal. Il suffit d'ouvrir et de feuilleter l'ouvrage intitulé: *Les Loix civiles dans leur ordre naturel, le droit public et le legum delectus*, par M. Domat, avocat du Roy au Siège Présidial de Clermont en Auvergne (1^{re} édition 1689), pour trouver exposée, avec force citations, cette théorie qui n'avait rien "d'effrayant" pour les contemporains de Pascal et qui ne faisait trembler personne au dix-septième siècle, que "les Cieux, les astres, la lumière, l'air et la mer sont des biens tellement communs à toute la société des hommes qu'aucun ne peut s'en rendre le maître ni en priver les autres" (*Livre préliminaire*, section 1, part 1). Et voici Domat qui invoque l'autorité de la Bible: "*quae creavit Dominus Deus tuus in ministerium cunctis gentibus, quae sub coelo sunt*" (*Deut.* IV, 19). C'est par la prise de possession et non en vertu d'un droit antérieur que la propriété a commencé selon Domat: "Ainsi la possession est en un sens la cause de la propriété . . . *Dominum rerum ex naturali possessione coepisse, Nerva filius ait. Ejusque rei vestigium remanere de his quae terra, mari, coeloque capiuntur; nam haec protinus eorum fiunt, qui primi possessione eorum apprehenderint.*"

C'est là exactement, exprimée en langage légal, la théorie illustrée par Pascal et mise en pratique par ces "pauvres enfants" se disputant la possession d'un chien perdu. Il n'y avait là ni rien de nouveau, ni attaque à faire frémir contre la société ou la propriété; mais simplement une affirmation que la propriété a commencé par une prise de possession. "Possession vaut titre," dit le vieil adage juridique, repris d'ailleurs par le Code civil qui est loin d'être un manifeste révolutionnaire. Pascal n'avait point dit autre chose.

Si l'on veut pousser plus loin et préciser la pensée de Pascal, on pourra le faire en se servant des textes même qu'il nous a laissés.

Peu lui importe au fond ces recherches qui intéressent surtout les juristes et cette "usurpation" originelle: "elle a été introduite autrefois sans raison, elle est devenue raisonnable; il faut la faire regarder comme authentique, éternelle, et en cacher le commencement si l'on ne veut qu'elle ne prenne bientôt fin" (Brunschvicg, n° 294). C'est que pour lui, comme pour ses contemporains et ses prédécesseurs, la propriété est d'origine essentiellement humaine et sociale et par conséquent, ajouterait Saint Augustin, imparfaite. C'est par la société, en vertu de conventions variables, qu'elle a été établie et qu'elle est encore réglementée; elle dépend du droit humain et "arbitraire" et non du droit naturel, ce qui n'implique d'ailleurs en aucune façon qu'elle soit injuste ou nuisible, ni qu'il faille l'abolir. C'est l'idée nettement exprimée dans le premier *Discours sur la Condition des Grands* qui, bien que rédigé par Nicole, paraît refléter la pensée pascalienne et exprime en tout cas l'opinion moyenne et courante du temps:

Ainsi tout le titre par lequel vous possédez votre bien n'est pas un titre de nature, mais un établissement humain. Un autre tour d'imagination dans ceux qui ont fait les lois vous aurait rendu pauvre; et ce n'est que cette rencontre de hasard qui nous a fait naître avec la fantaisie de ces lois favorables à votre égard, qui vous met en possession de tous ces biens. Je ne veux pas dire qu'ils ne vous appartiennent pas légitimement, et qu'il soit permis à un autre de vous les ravir; car Dieu, qui en est le maître a permis aux sociétés de faire des lois pour les partager; et quand les lois sont une fois établies, il est injuste de les violer.

De même, Domat, tout en proclamant l'existence d'un communisme de base, n'en reconnaissait pas moins la légitimité de la propriété individuelle, en ajoutant toutefois que la jouissance de cette propriété ne pouvait être pleinement exercée sans le concours de la société:

Ainsi en dehors de l'homme, les Cieux, les Astres, la lumière, l'air, nous sont des objets qui s'étalent aux hommes comme un bien commun à tous, et dont chacun a tout son usage. Et toutes les choses que la terre et les eaux portent ou produisent sont d'un usage commun aussi, mais de telle sorte qu'aucune ne passe à notre usage que par le travail de plusieurs personnes. Ce qui rend les hommes nécessaires les uns aux autres, et forme entr'eux les différentes liaisons pour les usages de l'agriculture, du commerce, des arts, des sciences, et pour toutes les autres communications que les divers besoins de la vie peuvent demander. (Ch. II, paragraphe II.)

Il ne s'ensuit pas que la société étant ainsi réglée soit vraiment bonne et juste. "*Veri juris*. Nous n'en avons plus," a dit Pascal

ailleurs (Brunschvicg, n° 297). Il aurait sans aucun doute souscrit au jugement sévère de son ami qui attribue les troubles de la société à la désobéissance de la loi qui commande l'amour de Dieu :

La première loi doit unir les hommes dans la possession du souverain bien. . . . L'homme ayant violé la première loi, il a recherché le bonheur dans les biens sensibles où il a trouvé deux défauts opposés à ces deux caractères du souverain bien, l'un que ces biens ne peuvent pas être possédés de tous, et l'autre qu'ils ne peuvent faire le bonheur d'aucun. La recherche de ces biens les a divisés. . . . C'est donc le dérèglement de l'amour qui a déréglé la société : et au lieu de cet amour mutuel dont le caractère étoit d'unir les hommes dans la recherche d'un bien commun ; on voit regner un autre amour tout opposé, dont le caractère lui a justement donné le nom d'amour propre ; parce que celui en qui cet amour domine ne recherche que des biens qu'il se rend propres, et qu'il n'aime dans les autres que ce qu'il ne peut rapporter à soy. (*Traité des lois*, ch. IX.)

Revenons maintenant au texte de Pascal. Même si nous donnons au mot 'usurpation' son sens le plus fort, nous voyons que la pensée qui a fait trembler Chateaubriand n'était guère au dix-septième siècle qu'un lieu commun de morale chrétienne et de morale juridique. Quand, dans ce monde qui a été créé par Dieu pour l'usage de tous, un homme entreprend de se réserver la possession exclusive d'une "place au soleil," il commet une véritable usurpation à l'égard du genre humain qui, selon le *verum jus*, en est le propriétaire légitime. Etant donné, d'autre part, que "nous n'avons plus" le sens de cette justice supérieure, et que, pour reprendre les termes de Domat, l'amour propre a remplacé l'amour mutuel, par suite de la faute originelle, il serait vain de rêver un rétablissement de la société primitive. Notre société humaine devra donc être ordonnée suivant des lois que les jurisconsultes qualifient d'arbitraires, *jus arbitrarium*, qui, par opposition avec les lois naturelles, sont "celles qu'une autorité légitime peut établir, changer et abolir selon le besoin," pour citer encore Domat. Quelle que soit l'origine des lois sur la propriété, elles doivent être observées, non qu'elles soient nécessairement justes, mais simplement parce qu'elles permettent d'éviter des troubles et des guerres civiles. "Sans doute, l'égalité des biens est juste," a dit encore Pascal (Brunschvicg, n° 299), "mais ne pouvant faire qu'il soit force d'obéir à la justice, on a fait qu'il soit juste d'obéir à la force . . . afin que le juste et le fort fussent ensemble, et que la paix fût, qui est le souverain bien." Veut-on d'autres textes ? Voici une phrase bien significative de Nicole (*Nouvelles lettres*, XL), citée par

Sainte-Beuve qui, du reste, n'en a pas saisi la portée et la qualifie de "très joli passage" (*Port-Royal*, III, 416, n.): "Comme les biens du monde étant naturellement communs deviennent propres à ceux qui s'en sont saisis, *occupantis fiunt* . . ." Replacée dans son cadre chronologique et comparée aux autres fragments sur la société, la pensée sur "l'usurpation de la terre" devient une simple constatation historique. C'est ainsi, croit Pascal, en bataillant et en luttant les uns contre les autres, que les hommes ont entrepris de se partager le domaine qu'ils avaient reçu du Créateur. Il n'y a là aucune raison de trembler et encore moins aucune raison de se demander à quelles extrémités la pensée de Pascal l'aurait conduit, s'il n'eût été chrétien. C'est précisément parce qu'il est chrétien et janséniste qu'il est persuadé qu'il nous est impossible, dans notre état de péché, de retourner à cette égalité qui a disparu d'entre nous.

Fils d'un magistrat, ami du juriste Domat, ayant lu les Pères de l'Eglise et au moins Saint Augustin et la Genèse, Pascal aurait pu difficilement parler autrement qu'il ne l'a fait. Il ne pouvait prévoir cette philosophie du dix-huitième siècle qui voulut revêtir de l'autorité de la "loi naturelle," et proclamer "inviolable et sacré," un droit que les jurisconsultes sacrés et profanes avaient jusque-là considéré comme dérivant de la société et comme devant être réglé par des lois "arbitraires." Mais, de là à croire qu'il y ait eu dans l'esprit de Pascal la moindre excitation à la révolte, le moindre appel à une révolution qui tenterait l'entreprise chimérique de rétablir un communisme primitif, il y a toute la distance qui sépare un solitaire de Port-Royal d'un éditeur moderne, hanté par le souvenir des convulsions sociales qui ont troublé notre monde depuis cent-cinquante ans. Il est même probable, les *Pensées* sont là pour l'attester, que Pascal aurait vu sans protester le guet intervenir pour disperser la troupe bruyante de galopins se disputant un chien rogneux au coin de la rue Brisemiche, ou le bedeau imposer silence à deux mendiants se bousculant sous le porche de l'église Saint-Sulpice.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

UN RECUEIL DE FARCES INÉDITES DU XV^e SIÈCLE

Parmi tant de trésors perdus—livres, manuscrits, clichés—j'en ai sauvé un que j'ai emporté de Paris à mon départ et réussi à amener aux Etats-Unis: une copie complète et exacte, faite sur l'original, d'un recueil de farces inédites du xv^e siècle. Si je parviens à en publier l'édition critique, je veux la dédier à l'érudit que nous honorons aujourd'hui et qui s'est fait un nom illustre comme historien du théâtre français.

Il a montré par ses patientes investigations qu'il y a encore des découvertes à faire, ce que j'enseigne toujours à mes élèves, qui, effrayés par nos formidables bibliographies, croient toujours qu'ils sont venus trop tard dans un monde trop vieux. Or dans tous les domaines il reste plus de besogne à accomplir que de besogne réalisée.

Sept ans se sont écoulés depuis la publication par Eugénie Droz du *Recueil Trepperel* (Paris, E. Droz, 1935, in-8°). Malheureusement il est resté incomplet, seul le premier volume *les Sotties* ayant vu le jour. La diligente éditrice en a promis deux autres, l'un consacré aux Moralités, l'autre aux Farces, mais la guerre n'en a évidemment pas favorisé l'éclosion. En fait de découvertes récentes relatives à notre ancien théâtre comique, je ne veux pas manquer de rappeler celles que fit Aebischer aux Archives de Fribourg et qu'il a publiées dans diverses revues.

Le recueil dont je vais parler a été vu ou plutôt aperçu par Mademoiselle Droz, qui en dit ceci à la page lvii de son Introduction :

Il y a lieu d'intercaler ici trois séries inconnues qui forment un recueil, conservé dans une bibliothèque privée. Ce volume, trouvé en même temps que le *Recueil Trepperel*, est d'un intérêt capital et il sera impossible de parler de la farce, en tant que genre littéraire, avant que ces pièces soient publiées. Je les ai examinées, trop rapidement à mon gré, à une époque où je n'avais pas encore l'espoir de publier le *Recueil Trepperel*, de sorte que je n'ai pu me livrer à aucune identification d'imprimeur, ni copier les textes.

Ce recueil est d'un format un peu plus petit que ceux que nous venons d'énumérer, il est imprimé en caractères gothiques de trois sortes, ce qui permet d'établir trois séries différentes.

Suit une liste très sommaire et pas toujours exacte, qu'il y a lieu de remplacer par celle que j'ai faite sur l'original, qui m'a été laissé

pendant tout le temps nécessaire à la copie (mais non à la collation) par un aimable "connoisseur," le baron Vitta, lequel l'a ensuite vendu à Lardanchet, le libraire de Lyon. La place me manque pour la reproduire ici, d'autant plus qu'elle comporte, comme il convient, une brève analyse des cinquante-trois pièces du Recueil.

On se contentera de déposer ici des conclusions sur trois points importants qui en résultent: I, Chronologie; II, Localisation; III, Types.

I. Chronologie. Les pièces paraissent avoir été imprimées vers 1540, mais l'on ne peut rien en conclure quand à leur date, car on sait que certaines farces du Moyen-Age l'ont été jusqu'au début du XVII^e siècle.

Dans la Farce LIII, Maulevault, parlant des gueux qu'il a connus, mentionne La Hire (1390-1443):

Dictes moy, n'ouïstes vous oncques
Parler des beaux faits de La Hire.

Dans la *Résurrection Jenin* celui-ci dit:

J'ay vu tous dis le povre Alain

—vers où il ne peut s'agir que d'Alain Chartier (1386-1449). La mention du *Jeu de Broche en cul* paraît se rapporter à une scène d'un Mystère inédit de la *Résurrection* (seconde moitié du XV^e siècle) que j'ai publiée dans mon article sur *la Scène de l'Aveugle et son valet* (*Romania*, 1912).

Si, comme le veulent Louis Cons et Richard Holbrook, le *Pathelin* est de 1464, la farce XLIV qui y fait allusion, semble-t-il, est postérieure:

Si tu vieulx et si parleré
Breton ou picard . . .

dit Gaultier, quand, faux prêtre, il se propose de recueillir la confession de Thierry. Le "Je luy feray manger de l'oue" du Savetier de la farce XXXIII pourrait être une autre référence à la célèbre comédie du trompeur trompé.

Une allusion précise à Maître Henry, c'est-à-dire Henry Cousin (cf. Pierre Champion, *François Villon*, II, 339), qui fut bourreau de Paris entre 1457 et 1479, nous reporte pour la farce XLII peu après la mort de celui-ci:

Si maistre Henry ne fust mort,
Nous fussions piéça despechés

dit Coquillon (allusion aux Coquillards dont fit vraisemblablement partie l'auteur du *Testament*), le maraud, prisonnier de Justice.

La Farce XIV présente une mention explicite de la bataille de Montlhéry livrée par le futur Charles le Téméraire à Louis XI le 16 juillet 1465:

Pensez qu'il en fist plusieurs rendre
La journée Mons le Hery.

Toutes ces allusions à des événements qu'il est possible de dater ou à des personnages dont la biographie nous est suffisamment connue nous ramènent à la deuxième moitié du *xv^e* siècle et en serrant les faits de plus près dans les années 80 à 90. Ceci nous est confirmé par des références à des pièces du *Recueil Trepperel*, par exemple, *Le Temps qui court*, dans II, et surtout dans notre même première farce, à Maître Mouche et à Triboulet:

Est ce point Maistre Mouche?

J'ay beu une quarte d'ung traict
Aussi bien que fist Triboulet

Une autre référence, cette fois dans la pièce XXVIII, à Dando Maréchal nous renvoie au même recueil. Trubert, le mari trompé, y dit:

Et certes je suis bien Dando,
Dando, mais plus que Dandinastre.

D'autres allusions à Thenot (cf. *Répertoire*, p. 121) dans la farce IV, au povre Jouan dans la farce XXV, à Grantgosier le buveur, type qu'adoptera Rabelais et dont je découvre ici la première mention, ne permettent pas de datation aussi précise.

II. Deuxième point: Localisation.

Dans la farce IV les mots "Irons-nous sur Navarricus?" ne peuvent guère se rapporter qu'au Collège de Navarre à Paris; la librairie des Augustins, nommée dans IX, est parisienne aussi, mais la pièce LIII est à cet égard décisive. Lisez plutôt:

MAULEVAULT

.
. se l'aventure
M'avenoit et mon ancestrure
Seroit du tout renouvelée
Et seroit Greve relevée
Saint Innocent et Petit Pont.

PAIN PERDU

D'où je vien? Je vien d'Avignon.

POU D'ACQUEST

Or devisons mes mignons
Qu'on dit de beau parmy Paris.

MAULEVAULT

On le vent à chariotées
En Greve et aussi aux Halles.

POU D'ACQUEST

Et je vy passer ung bateau
Auprès de l'isle Nostre Dame.

PAIN PERDU

Car le maindre est com je suppose
Beaucoup plus grosse qu'ung groseil
Ne la *Pierre de Mauconseil*
Ou du Palays lyez ensemble.

.
Où en chacune a ung clocher
Grant comme les tours Nostre Dame.

PAIN PERDU

Où trouverons-nous au Chasteau?

MAULEVAULT

Y a il ame?

POU D'ACQUEST

Je cuyde que lui [le clerc] et la dame
Comptent ensemble du Chasteau.

POU D'ACQUEST

Tu me dis pas se les sergens
Passent par cy qu'ilz nous trouvassent
J'auroye grant peur qu'ilz nous menassent
En Chastellet sans arrester

POU D'ACQUEST [au Clerc du Château]

Or ne te chault se je te treuve
De cest an ne de l'autre en Greve

.
Cuide-tu estre bourgoys de la cité
Ou escollier de l'Université?

.
Je vous feray par les sergens
Au Chastellet mener tout droit.

PAIN PERDU

Nous sommes d'une nation
Tous trois et si me font cecy.

Ce pourrait être une exception, mais la pièce précédente, la *LIT^e* nous ramène aussi au centre de Paris.

ROLHIART [mendiant]

Je te jure par saint Martin
Que aujourd'hui à ce matin
Allé m'en suis a la grant sale
Du grant Palais et puis aux Halles
Vu que trouver ne te povoye
Et en passant parmy la voye
Arté(?), me suis emmy la place
Icy tout droit dessus me masse
Querant pour povre loqueteux

Le nomme le célèbre cabaret de La Pomme de pin, le *Champ Gaillard*, et "les enfans de Beauvais," c'est-à-dire le Collège. *XLIX* joue sur la *table de marbre* qui est celle du Palais et parle de la Halle et des Quinze Vingts. En *XLVII* Bontemps chemine dans Paris, tandis que dans *XLVI* la Bragarde va à Bagnolet et à Saint Germain des Prés, à Saint-Mery, à Boulogne et la Theologienne à Montmartre, au Pèlerinage de Saint-Maur et à l'Hôtel Dieu. *XLIV* parle des "tours Nostre Dame," du tertre de Mont Valérien, des Quinze Vingts et du Parlement. *XLII* est plus précis encore :

SOU'D'OUVRER

Et moy j'estoie encore jeun
Au matin ainsi qu'on se lieve
Entre le Port au fain et Greve,
Entre ses chantiers de busches
Trois sergens estoient en embusches
Qui m'enpoignerent au collet
Et me menerent au Chastellet,
Vela comme je fus prins.

XXXVIII, *XXXIX*, nous orientent aussi vers Paris. *XXXIII* nomme le Petit Pont, *XXIX* Charonne, *XXVIII* Bagnolet, Clamart, Gentilly, Meudon, Baigneux, qui sont ces environs de Paris où nous avons coutume d'aller encore le dimanche. La Farce des Fauconniers (*XXVI*) s'y situe aussi de même que la *XXV^e* à cause des Saints Innocents. Dans *XXII* Bietrix invite Fricquette :

Veux tu point venir au Palais
Et puis sur le Pont Notre Dame

puis parle ailleurs du Pont de Neuilly, tandis que dans *XX* la Femme invoque devant le Juge l'ordonnance du Prévôt de la Porte

Bodès prescrivant que le mari obéisse à sa femme.¹ L'espace me manque pour prouver, mais mes preuves seraient aussi évidentes, que XVIII, XVII où Guillemette se propose un pèlerinage à Notre Dame des Champs, XVI où Alison déclare avoir étudié aux Jacobins, aux Carmes, aux Augustins, aux Mathurins et aux Cordeliers, et qui parle du Cardinal Lemoine, XV qui mentionne saint Innocent, et X, Saint Gervais, IV qui invoque Notre Dame de Montfort, et III, le Petit Pont, II Charolles, et I le clocher de Saint Jean, ressortissent non moins à l'*incklyte Lutèce*.

III. Les Types.

Ainsi pour la plupart des pièces peu de doutes sur la date 1480 à 1490 et sur leur provenance parisienne, mais il reste à préciser quels milieux elles concernent, pour quels acteurs elles ont été conçues : Enfants sans souci, Clercs de la Basoche, Écoliers des Collèges de l'Université de Paris ou comédiens professionnels.

Les Clercs de la Basoche auxquels H. G. Harvey vient de consacrer un ouvrage² peuvent entrer en ligne de compte pour certaines pièces où la table de Marbre et le Palais sont nommément cités ; pour d'autres l'abondance de références à des collèges parisiens fait pencher pour leurs Écoliers, mais mon attention a été plus attirée par les références à Dando Mareschal (XXVIII), Maistre Regnault (XVI), Alison (XVI) qui subsistera dans la Comédie du XVII^e siècle, Maistre Gonin, qui figure aussi dans le Dialogue II du *Cymbalum Mundi*, Godin Falot, Maistre Aliborum (VI), Thenot (IV, V, XXV), Maistre Mymin (IV), le pédant bravache, Ganache (III), Maistre Mouche (I), Gilbert Cochet (I), Guillaume du Sepulcre (XLIX), Bon Temps (XLVII), le Goguelu (XLV), Turlupin (XVII), le Franc Archer (XIV), Gaultier Gargille (V), Jenin (I), Roger Bontemps (I), povre Jouan (XXV), Triboulet (I).

Autant de noms, autant de types ou plutôt d'"emplois," apparentés à ceux de la Comédie italienne, ou au théâtre comique français du XVII^e siècle (Gaultier Garguille, Turlupin, Alison, Gros-Guillaume), susceptibles de transformations sociales, professionnelles, morales, mais confiées originairement à un acteur unique

¹ "Le Heaume de la Porte Baudet" lit-on dans les Comptes de la Sainte Chapelle, Bibl. Nat. fonds français 2239. 2, cité par Pierre Champion, *op. cit.*, I, 125, note 5.

² Howard Graham Harvey, *The Theatre of the Basoche*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1941.

aimé du public, qui tient à applaudir sous divers déguisements son favori.

A cet égard j'insiste surtout sur Dando Mareschal et Maistre Aliboron qui figurent déjà dans la Sottie IX du *Recueil Trepperel*, *Sottie des Sots qui corrigent le Magnificat à cinq personnages* (avant 1488). De son côté Triboulet nommé en corrélation avec Maistre Mouche est ce capitaine des Sots dont on prépare les prétendues obsèques dans les *Vigiles de Triboulet* (vers 1480), x^e sottie du *Recueil Trepperel*, et qui est certainement un farceur célèbre comme Rossignol, autre acteur des *Vigiles*, et quant à Maître Mouche, il apparaît comme le patron de Triboulet.

Ainsi nous sommes amenés par le recueil inédit à reviser notre conception du théâtre comique français au xv^e siècle, à le considérer comme plus professionnel et évoluant nettement vers la création de types analogues à ceux de la comédie italienne à laquelle il a peut-être servi de modèle et à ceux de la comédie française ultérieure dont l'identité des noms (Alison, Gaultier, Garguille, etc.) prouve qu'il a inauguré et déterminé la tradition.

GUSTAVE COHEN

Yale University

FIVE NOTES ON THE TEXT OF VILLON¹

Le Lais xxx: Item, je laisse aux hospitaux
 Mes chassiz tissus d'arigniee,
 Et aux gisans soubz les estaux,
 Chascun sur l'œil une grongniee,
 Trembler a chiere renfrongniee,
 Megres, velus et morfondus,
 Chausses courtes, robe rongniee,
 Gelez, murdis et enfondus.

Villon does not express in these lines a "conventional medieval brutality." They reflect instead the poet's own determination to make his way by any means and his contempt for the "gisans soubz

¹ [Professor Cons, who had promised some notes on Villon for this issue, unfortunately had not put them into shape at the time of his death. Through the kindness of Mrs. Cons and of his secretary, Mr. Milton Crane, however, we were given access to part of this material, and we here present it in necessarily inadequate and skeletal form with thanks to them for making it available. The text of Villon used is that of the Longnon-Foulet 4th ed., *OFMA*, 1932.]

les estaux" who lacked the courage and boldness to become criminals like himself.

Le Testament 337-340: Ou est la tres sage Hellois,
 Pour qui chastré fut et puis moyne
 Pierre Esbaillart a Saint Denis?
 Pour son amour ot ceste essoyne.

Essoyne in this instance has the specific meaning of "mutilation." Cf. Du Cange, s. v. *sunnis*: *exoniare corpore*; see *mehargnast ou exoinast du corps*.

Le Testament LXXXVIII: Je luy donne ma librairie,
 Et le Rommant du Pet au Deable,
 Lequel maistre Guy Tabarie
 Grossa, qui est homs veritable.
 Par cayers est soubz une table;
 Combien qu'il soit rudement fait,
 La matiere est si tres notable
 Qu'elle amende tout le mesfait.

Since the description of Tabarie as "homs veritable" is patently ironic, the contents of this strophe must be viewed with suspicion. In any case the existence of an early "Pet au Diable," assumed by most authorities, must be questioned.

Le Testament CLXVIII: Item, donne aux amans enfermes,
 Sans le laiz maistre Alain Chartier,
 A leurs chevez, de pleurs et lermes . . .

The second line must mean "in addition to the *Lais* of Alain Chartier." MS O and Levet read *Oultre*.

Le Debat du Cuer et du Corps de Villon, 41 ff.:
 Veuix tu vivre?—Dieu m'en doint la puissance!—
 Il te fault . . .—Quoy?—Remors de conscience,
 Lire sans fin.—En quoy?—Lire en science,
 Laisser les folz!—Bien j'y adviseray.—

"Science" in the third line means "theology" (cf. Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye and Littré). It is probable that Villon wrote this *Debat* partly in order to curry favor with the ecclesiastical authorities and thus obtain his release from prison. The interpretation of "science" as "theology" would support this theory.

THE DISTANT LOVE OF JAUFRÉ RUDEL

While it is generally recognized that the ancient biography of Jaufré Rudel is little more than a fanciful and charming pseudo-historical romance, derived in large measure from his own verses, nevertheless many modern students have been unable to resist the temptation—against which Olin Moore long ago warned us (*PMLA*. xxix, 1914, 518)—of rejecting the Provençal *vida* only to attempt themselves to reconstruct the poet's life from his works. Thus it has come about that in modern times his fabulous, far-away "comtessa de Tripol" has inspired not only the most lyrical of poets, but also, unhappily, the prosiest of scholars. We find Monaci asserting, for example, that in the space of six short poems Rudel could hardly have been writing to two different women (*sancta simplicitas*!): there must have been only one, and that one for various reasons he would identify with Eleanor of Aquitaine. Jeanroy, on the other hand, believes that two different loves must be involved, one real and accessible, the other ideal and far-away. For Appel, the distant one may even have been a truly *erdenferne Liebe*, none other than the Blessed Virgin Mary herself; for Vossler she may be a literary echo of Ovid's Helen; whereas for Casella this love has a purely spiritual existence, and the lady is "una visualizzazione intensiva, una rassomiglianza . . . del suo stesso amore."¹

Usually the *jeu d'esprit* that consists in trying to identify the ladies of the troubadours is a harmless, albeit fruitless diversion, but in this case I think it has led to a somewhat serious misinterpretation of the poet's meaning and purpose, for the phrase *amors de terra lonhdana* taken by itself and without reference to the *vida* seems naturally to refer not to the Countess of Tripoli, not to Eleanor of Aquitaine, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Helen of Troy, nor

¹ Cf. G. Paris, *Mélanges de litt. fr.*, ed. Roques, 498 ff. (original article, 1893); Monaci, *Rendiconti della Reale Acc. dei Lincei*, serie V, 2, 1893, 927 ff.; Appel, *Archiv* cvii, 1901, 338 ff.; Vossler, *Sitz. d. K. Bayer. Ak. der Wissenschaften, Philos.-philog. Kl.*, 1918, 133 ff.; Jeanroy's second ed., *CFMA.*, 1924, iii ff.; M. Casella, *Archivio Storico Italiano*, II, 1938, 153 ff. Casella brushes away the realistic elements that others find in the poems by assuming that the poet's dreams result in illusions at times or are filled with objective images (p 172-3). He even finds evidence (186-7) of an intensive intuition of spiritual love in the line "Que-l cors a gras, delgat e gen" (I, 12).

to a purely spiritual passion, but to the poet's love of a distant land, i. e. the Holy Land, here personified, or represented figuratively, as love of a far-away mistress.

An analysis of the poem, "Quan lo rius de la fontana," with this interpretation in mind resolves many of its apparent difficulties. After identifying his song with the spring-time music of brook, budding eglantine and nightingale, the poet tells us that his love of a distant land makes him sad and that he can find no cure for his sadness if, because of the attractions of a more human passion (ab atraich d'amor doussana), he fails to heed this love (si non au vostre reclam). In other words, his soul will not be saved if desire for a woman of flesh and blood prevent him from going to the Holy Land, a thought that should be compared with that at the end of his "Quan lo rossinhols el folhos" where he says that he leaves his lady gladly since he goes seeking his spiritual welfare, nor can he understand how those who do not follow God into Bethlehem will ever achieve salvation. In the third stanza he writes that as the opportunity to satisfy his zeal for the Holy Land is denied him, it is not to be wondered at that he is aflame with desire, for never was there fairer Christian, Jewess or Saracen than his far-away love; a man who gains something from such a love is indeed fed with manna (i. e. those who go on this Crusade shall have the spiritual sustenance of *Exodus* xvi). His heart, he says in his fourth stanza, never ceases to desire that which he most loves, and if lust should now rob him of his love, then, he believes, his will-power would be betraying him, for the grief which is cured by the joys of love is sharper than a thorn; in that case he would not wish others to pity him. The poem concludes with an *Envoi* in which Rudel sends his verses without benefit of parchment to be sung by Filhol (probably a jongleur) to Hugh the Brown of Lusignan, and in which he says it pleases him that the people of Poitou, Berry, Guienne and Brittany delight in his love.²

and why should a reference to these provinces form its conclusion? We know little of Hugh, but we do know that the members of the house of Lusignan were vassals of the Count of Poitou and that this Hugh VII was among the first to take the Cross at Vezelay in 1146.³ As to the provinces, the only reason which has been advanced for this mention of them is that of Monaci, namely, that they belonged to the domain of Eleanor of Aquitaine. But Berry and Brittany formed no part of her domain until after her marriage to Louis VII, and then of course all four provinces belonged to the King of France.⁴ Indeed it may be that our poet intended nothing more by his words than a fairly inclusive reference to France, such as Marcabrun voiced when he wrote:

Mas Franssa, Peitau e Beiriu
Aclina un sol seignoriu. (xxii, 55-56)

However, it is well known that after the Second Crusade was officially launched at Vezelay on March 31, 1146, the King with his wife began a tour through his estates, collecting funds and attempting to arouse enthusiasm for the projected voyage to Jerusalem. He was especially successful in Poitou and Guenne,⁵ and it would not be surprising if Rudel in addressing a vassal of the Count of Poitou and one who had recently enrolled as a crusader should mention the zeal of this part of the realm. Similarly, the reference to Berry may be attributable to the fact that it was at Bourges, the capital of Berry, that the King first solemnly revealed to his barons his determination to go to the rescue of the Christians in Syria. Brittany's role in the Second Crusade is somewhat obscure, but it is established that St. Bernard through his secretary invited the counts and barons of Brittany to take the Cross, writing: "Nolite deserere solum Regem vestrum, Regem Francorum, imo

³ See Suger, *Vie de Louis le Gros*, etc., ed. A. Molinier, Paris, 1887, p. 159. A letter has been preserved from Hugh to Suger promising to inform him about affairs in Poitou through a certain Wiormand. See *Rec. des hist. de France* xv, 486. On connections between the house of Lusignan and the Counts of Poitou, see A. Richard, *Hist. des Comtes de Poitou*, Paris, 1903, I, 157 ff. and Index.

⁴ Cf. A. Richard, *op. cit.*, II, 52 ff., 57. Appel, *op. cit.*, 339 says that Brittany did not belong to her dominion either before or after her marriage.

⁵ Richard, *op. cit.* II, 84 ff.

⁶ On Christmas Day, 1145. See Lavissee, *Hist. de France* III, 1, 1902, II ff.

Regem coelorum," and that St. Bernard's influence was especially potent in the province at this time.⁷

It would seem appropriate therefore that Jaufré Rudel should send a poem about his *amors de terra lonhdana*, his longing to participate in a crusade, to a man who had recently taken the Cross, adding that he was happy certain provinces of the kingdom of France were responding to the call for crusaders. Significantly enough, another poem by Rudel, "Quan lo rossinhols el folhos," has always been recognized as connected with the Second Crusade and indeed as one of the very few surviving poems associated with it.⁸ If the present interpretation of "Quan lo rius de la fontana" is correct, then this poem too was inspired by that undertaking.

Moreover, the famous "Lanquan li jorn son lonc en may" should likewise be placed in this group, in my opinion, for here the re-occurring phrase "amor de lonh," like "amors de terra lonhdana" in "Quan lo rius," can best be understood as a reference to the poet's longing for a distant land translated and personified in terms of a human passion. Thus in the second stanza Rudel says at once: Be tenc lo Senhor per veray / Per qu'ieu veirai l'amor de lonh, "I hold Him indeed for my true Lord, Him through whom I shall see my distant love," and wishes that he had been a pilgrim there where the eyes of his love (the Holy Land) might have beheld his staff and cloak. He desires to be lodged near his love, however far

⁷ Migne, P. L. 182, col. 671-2 In the First Crusade, Alain Fergent, Duke of Brittany, had been among the very earliest to take the Cross (B-A. Pocquet du Haut-Jusse, "Les Papes et les Ducs de Bretagne," *Bibl. des Ecoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 133, Paris, 1928, I, 20). On the rôle of Brittany in the Second Crusade, cf. Pocquet du Haut-Jusse, *op. cit.* I, 21 and Watkin Williams, *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux*, Manchester, 1935, 268. St. Bernard had personal relations with Duchess Ermengarde (d. 1147) and her son, Duke Conon III (d. 1148), and it was owing to him that so many and such rich Cistercian abbeys were founded in Brittany. See A. de La Borderie, *Hist. de Bretagne*, Rennes, 1906, III, 42, 189 ff.

⁸ The only poems usually associated with the Second Crusade, besides Rudel's "Quan lo rossinhols," are Marcabrun's *Romanza* ("A la fontana del vergier") and an anonymous French song ("Chevalier, mult estes guariz," ed. Bédier-Aubry, *Chansons de Croisade*, p. 3). Cf. Lewent in *Rom. Forsch.* XXI, 1908, 337, 339, 419. To these Jeanroy (*Poésie lyrique des troubadours* II, 205, 299, 331) would add Marcabrun's "Empereaire per mi mezeis" (ed. Dejeanne, XXII), although Boissonade (*Romania* 48, 1922, 222) and Appel (*ZRP* 43, 1923, 411 ff.) more plausibly date this poem in 1137 or 1138, rather than in 1146.

away he is now, and yet, he tells us, if ever he could see his *amor de lonh*, he would leave this distant love sadly and yet rejoicing. Note that *gauzens* in line 22, "rejoicing," is both courteous and comprehensible if the distant love be a reconquered Jerusalem rather than a human mistress. In the fifth stanza, this *amor de lonh* is said to be better than any other: its worth is so true and pure that for its sake, the poet affirms, he would be willing to be called a captive there in the land of the Saracens. May God give him the strength—as he has the will—to see his distant love truly, in such wise that room and garden may ever resemble a palace to him. (This appears to mean merely that he hopes to be strong enough to reach the Holy Land and to envisage any hardships there as advantages.)

Whether the next ten lines (43-52) belong to the poem in its original form is problematical. I should be inclined to reject them—the last three are in only two of the fourteen manuscripts and the other seven occur together only in these two and two others, although a few of them appear in isolation in three further manuscripts. If authentic, however, they would indicate that no other joy so pleases the poet as his distant love, but that somehow he is prevented from attaining his desire. Whether, as these lines suggest (and cf. "Quan lo rius," l. 15), some temporary obstacle prevented a journey to the Holy Land, we do not know. We are fairly certain, however, that he eventually achieved his wish since Marcabrun's poem, "Cortesamen vuoll comenssar," is addressed "a n Jaufré Rudel outra mar" and Marcabrun hopes the French will enjoy his verses.⁹

The fact that Rudel is linked by Marcabrun with the crusade and with the French fortifies the hypothesis suggested above. In any case, on the evidence of three of his poems,¹⁰ it would seem that

⁹ Ed. Dejeanne, xv. Boissonade, *op. cit.* 228, who dates this poem in the latter part of 1148, shows that considerable time elapsed between the departure of Louis VII and the arrival of the various crusading units in the Holy Land. It may be that one or another of the delays en route constituted the obstacle of which Rudel seemingly complains.

¹⁰ The three other poems of Rudel (III, IV, VI in Jeanroy's edition) seem to me to have no connection with the Crusade. Although VI is sometimes placed with the poems which sing of a far-away love, its light, jesting tone, so unlike that of I, II and V, recalls rather that of the *Devinalh* ("Farai un vers de dreit nien") by Guillaume IX, as G. Paris, Jeanroy and Hoepfner have suggested. (Paris, *Mélanges*, 522 ff.; Jeanroy, ed.

the poet ardently longed to go to the Holy Land and that his far-away love was no lady of flesh and blood, but the ideal of so many men of the Middle Ages who sought, whether as pilgrims or crusaders, eternal salvation there where "on conquiert Paradis et honor et pris et los et l'amor de s'amie." Why the later Provençal biographer interpreted these poems fancifully and, accepting the poet's own words, translated the spiritual longings of the crusader into purely human terms is readily comprehensible: he lived at a time when the spirit of the early crusades was long since dead, but when, as in all times, the romance of a poet dying in the arms of the lady of his dreams was vital and lovely. Playing upon phrases taken from the poems, he wrote an appealing tale, one whose influence has been as potent through the ages as the verses that inspired it.

In conclusion, it may be remarked that most scholars have always been aware of some sort of contrast in Rudel's poetry: between fact and fiction, waking and dreaming, flesh and spirit, the real and the ideal. Perhaps, however, in writing of him and especially of other troubadours, they have not sufficiently remembered that even the "real" loves of the troubadours must be subject to suspicion. Many a modern poet writes love lyrics compounded of emotions that are at once realistic and idealized. With how much more reason must this have been true of mediaeval poets! Wandering from court to court, or sending their verses to be sung by jongleurs before different courtly circles, they had to make their poems acceptable to varying potential patronesses. Moreover, intricate conventions both of form and matter must have imposed heavy restrictions upon them at all times. Whether any residue of "reality" remains in verses written in such circumstances is necessarily difficult to determine. It should also be remembered that the professional poet, however "realistic" or "idealistic" he may have been by nature, might conceivably write more than one type of love-poem. To the

1924, p. vi, note 2; Hoepffner, *Romania* LXIII, 1937, 99-101.) Curiously enough, Casella seems to find no difference of tone in this poem and thinks the poet has here given us "un' imagine spirituale di se stesso" (p. 172). Here, as elsewhere, it is this critic's effort to base all of Rudel's poetry—as well as that of Guillaume IX—upon the philosophy of Augustine, to schematize their works and view their poetry isolated from that of all the other troubadours, which vitiates certain of his otherwise sensitive interpretations.

wife of a noble patron he doubtless had to be reverent rather than intimate. Writing a song for general distribution, he might sing of some lady, real or presumptive, in more fleshly terms, and this with a change of *tornada* or *senhal* might on occasion serve either his own purposes or those of the jongleurs who ever came to him begging for new compositions.¹¹ If then we do not assume a real love-affair for every modern love-lyric, how incredibly naive it is to attempt after the lapse of some eight hundred years, and with only pseudo-historical romances to guide us, to identify the ladies of the troubadours. Similarly doomed to failure, it seems to me, is such an effort as Casella's, that is, to reduce poems written in varying circumstances and by poets as essentially unlike as Guillaume IX and Jaufré Rudel to the same Augustinian formulae. The problem, with the mediaeval as with the modern poet, is not so simple as that. In the case of Rudel's distant love, at any rate, we seem to have good reason for distrusting both the biographical and aprioristic approaches.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

FATHER AND SON IN PROVENÇAL POETRY¹

The object of this study is to deal with one verse in a troubadour poem, the correct explanation of which I failed to find almost forty years ago, and which I have found—or, at least, hope to have found—quite recently.

The verse to which I refer belongs to a Provençal Crusade Song. Its author is Elias Cairel, a far-traveled troubadour, whose restless spirit led him as far as Hungary and Greece; an echo of these wanderings is to be found in our poem (*Gr.* 133, 11). After an exhortation addressed to Christendom in general to reconquer the Holy Land, and even Cairo, the capital of Egypt, he directs the crusaders to go by Hungary and Greece, and, on their way, to help the Empress Yolenta, whose throne, which was that of the Latin Empire, was in danger. He has indicated the same itinerary as that followed, almost 20 years earlier, by the Christian armies who had

¹¹ Cf. also Scheludko, *Neuph. Mitt.* xxv, 1934, 1 ff.

¹ This article reproduces—slightly changed—a paper read at the 1941 meeting of the Modern Language Association in Indianapolis.

started from Venice, on what is called the fourth crusade. In the last stanza the poet turns to one of the most prominent monarchs of that time, Frederick II, Emperor of Germany. Before being crowned, Frederick had promised the Pope to undertake a crusade shortly after his succession to the throne of his father, Henry VI, who himself had died in the midst of gigantic preparations for such an expedition. It is known that Frederick again and again postponed the fulfillment of his promise—for which reason he was anathematized. It is to this promise that the troubadour alludes in the last stanza (vi), which contains the verse in question:

Emperor Frederick, I tell you that a vassal has undertaken to work his own damage if, having promised aught to his liege lord, he abandons him in the great emergency. Therefore, I would ask you and tell you in my song to cross over to the country where Jesus Christ chose to die, and do not disappoint him in this affair, *for it is not good that herein the father should wait for the son.*

The Provençal text of the line in question runs: *E ges lo filh no·i deu atendre·l paire*. When I first edited this poem for my doctor's thesis,² I interpreted the line to read . . . *atendr'e·l paire*, translating: "For the father and the son must not wait in this affair." Father and son, of course, were to be understood in the religious sense of God the Father and the Son of God, both of whom were equally interested in the liberation of the Holy Land. But then the text should rather be: *quar ges lo filhs non deu atendre ni·l paire* instead of *e·l paire*; and to substitute *ni* would be to give the line one syllable too many.

A strange explanation of this verse is ventured by Andresen (cf. Wittenberg, *Die Hohenstaufen im Munde der Troubadours*, p. 57, note 6) who interprets it: "for never shall the son (Frederick) herein pay attention to the father (Henry VI)": in this way the attitude of Henry toward crusades is supposedly censured. But there is no historical foundation for such a reproach addressed to Henry VI; on the contrary, as we have just seen, he died while preparing for just such an expedition.

This explanation, however, stands apart; all my critics had agreed with me on the one point that there was a religious meaning involved in this verse. The interpretation offered in the translation of the stanza given above ("It is not good that herein the

² *Das altprov. Kreuzlied*, Erlangen 1905, p. 114.

father should wait for the son") was first suggested by Emil Levy, in a long letter written to me; this was accepted by Schultz-Gora in the "Literaturblatt" xxvii (1906), p. 291, and finally, by the editor of Elias Cairel's poems, Hilde Jaeschke.³ Schultz-Gora added a further explanation: Jesus Christ is the father and his sons are men—in this particular case, the Emperor Frederick. That the 'Father' could refer to Christ is, according to Schultz-Gora, substantiated by the fact that in the Middle Ages Christ is often confused with God the Father (this point is treated at length by L. E. Wels in "Theologische Streifzüge durch die altfranzösische Literatur," Vechta, 1937, ch. II). But the question still remains: why does the poet lay such stress on the Emperor's being a son of God—a title he must share with all other Christians?

In a poem of Bertran d'Alamanon, another troubadour, there might seem to be confirmation of such a title given to the German Emperor; in this poem⁴ which deals with the political conditions of the time (of the German Interregnum) it is proposed that the two competitors for the crown should fight for it in personal combat; the stanza in question ends: "That one will be called Son of God who will have won the victory in the field." But probably the poet meant to say by this only that the ordeal proposed by him would prove that the victor was protected by God—was a true son of God. I have not been able to discover either in imperial documents of that time or in historical books the slightest indication that such a title was actually borne by the German Emperors; the reason is still to be found why, in the poem of Elias Cairel, Frederick should have been represented by a title which every Christian was entitled to bear.

According to a remark in Miss Jaeschke's edition of Cairel's poems, the opinion was held by Appel that some proverb must be at the root of the troubadour's words. In this connection Miss Jaeschke draws our attention to an expression of Cato's: *Parentes patienter vince* which appears in the Old French translation as *Veindre ton pere voilles e sormonter Par souffrance et par mesure*. But I fail to see how this distich can apply to the line in the Provençal crusade song; and Miss Jaeschke herself was forced to confess that she was unable to find a proverb which might explain the verse of her poet.

³ *Der Trobador Elias Cairel*, Berlin 1921, p. 164.

⁴ Ed. Salverda de Grave, Toulouse 1902, p. 54.

In the chronicle of the Albigensian crusade, edited by Paul Meyer (1875-79), there is a passage (ll. 3959 ss.) which will perhaps throw some light upon our problem. It deals with one of those descriptions of warlike activity in which a great number of persons participate, and reads as follows:

Ladoncs viratz sautar e correr e destendie,
laus d'els evas l'autre e cridar et contendre,
c'anc no·i remas lo paire per lo filh ni pel gendre,
que los murs e las portas van debrizar e fendre.

"Then might you have seen people jumping, running, rushing, shouting to one another and vying together, and never would the father have stayed behind for the son or the son-in-law: they broke and shattered the walls and doors." In a note added to the translation in Vol. II, the editor of the chronicle refers to two similar passages, the first of which is from the same work (ll. 1186-87):

Plus foron de CCC, c'us so par non atent,
ans van a Carcassona qui plus pot plus corrent.

"They were more than three hundred, none of whom waits for his companion, but they rather go to Carcassonne however quickly they can." The second passage occurs in the "History of the Taking of Damiette":

E l filh non agardava lo payre, ni·l payres lo filh.

"And the son did not wait for the father nor did the father for the son."

The meaning of this expression is obvious: If you say that different persons who are to work at the same task do not wait for one another to begin it, you mean to say that each of them is in the greatest hurry to do his share of the work. This interpretation is corroborated by additional expressions such as are found in the last example: *qui plus pot plus corrent*.

The two examples quoted from the Albigensian chronicle may be matched by others from that epic, which the editor fails to mention:

1)

E·lh baro de Tholoza se son anat garnir,
que l'us no aten l'autre c'armas posca sufrir.

(ll. 7357-8).

"And the barons of Toulouse have gone to arm themselves, and they do not wait for one another to bear weapons."

2)

E li autre s'en eison per mieï los pons corrent,
cavalers e borzes, e arquer e sirvent,
e tuit passeron l'aiga que negus no s'atent

(ll. 7494-96).

"And the others go quickly out over the bridges, knights and citizens, and archers and servants, and all of them cross the water without waiting for one another."

3) The citizens of Toulouse are summoned to construct new fortifications and to strengthen the old:

Ladoncas van a l'obra aisi cominalment
que·ls paires ni las maires ni li filh ni·lh parent,
l'us no espera l'autre ni·l pobres lo manent

"Then they set to work in common, so that none of them—fathers and mothers, sons and (other) relatives—waits for the other, nor the poor man for the rich."

This manner of indicating the hurry and eagerness with which a group of persons set to work was known also to Old French; in Tobler-Lommatzsch I, 631,30 s. v. *attendre* one finds the following quotation from the chronicle of Guillaume Guiart, who is describing a general flight: *A briez moz, nul n'atent la per*: "in brief words, no one waits for his companion." The reader is referred by Lommatzsch to the volume which is to contain the word *per*—as if to suggest that there will be other examples of the same kind of expression (though in Godefroy's dictionary of Old French not a single example is offered).

The following two examples will no doubt also prove helpful:

- (1) Et cil respont: "Il s'en vont la devant;
ja pevent estre siz liuees avant;
il n'i attendent ne cosin ne parent;⁵
de lor somiers ont laissiés ne sai quans."
Dit Auberis: "Il fuient voiremant . . ."
Garin le Loh., ed. du Mèril, I 3908
- (2) Li doncel saillent qui orent en la mer,
n'i a celui qui atendist son per.
P. Meyer, Alexandre le Grand I, 246, l. 206⁶

⁵ The editor puts commas before each of the two *ne*'s, obviously considering *ne cosin ne parent* as in apposition to *il*. But *ne cosin ne parent* is the object of *atendent*.

⁶ This example was indicated to me by Professor Alfred Foulet of Prince-

Moreover something of the kind still exists in modern French. Littré quotes (I, 232 a, n^o. 6) from Corneille's "Le Cid": *Un coup n'attendait pas l'autre*, 'les coups se succédaient sans interruption.' I may add another example from Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables" (II, v, ix): *Un mot n'attendait pas l'autre*.

All these examples, especially those taken from Old Provençal, clearly show, it seems to me, that Elias Cairel, in opposing father and son, was not creating an individual stylistic device, but was using a phrase which was already at hand in his own tongue. Indeed it was a rather frequent procedure among the Provençal poets when making an assertion about a species, to split this, as it were, into two contrasting parts, thus emphasizing that any exception to the assertion is excluded. For example, the fact that all men must die is expressed by Giraut de Bornelh (*Gr.* 242,26 = Kolsen n^o. 74; II, 1): *C'oi non es om altz ni bas Que per la greu mort non pas*, "There is no man, high or low, that has not to pass through grievous death." Here the species 'man' is divided into persons of high and low estate, in order to show that neither of these groups (i. e. none of the whole species) can escape death. The use of such an expression makes the assertion more concrete and stronger than would the unimaginative numeral 'all'—in such a sentence as "all men must die." Another poet, Aimeric de Belenoi, in expressing a similar idea, divides mankind into the small and the great (*Gr.* 9, 6 = Dumitrescu, p. 112-III, 5): *Als petitç es als grans Es naisers e morirs e perirs comunals*, "the small and the great have birth and death, salvation and perishing, in common." The author of the Albigensian chronicle, too, avails himself of the same device: *E juro·lh del castel e paubres e manens* (l. 1723); "and those of the castle, the poor and the rich, swore it"; (l. 7853): *E can iran essem li filh e li pairon, Entre·ls brans e las massas farem tal chaplazon . . .*, "and when the sons and the fathers (i. e. all of them) will be going along, we shall make such a carnage with swords and cudgels. . . ."

This example is particularly for our purposes. It shows how this manner of expression has gradually become a merely mechanical

ton University. [Cf. *L'Histoire de Gille de Chyn*, ed. Place, 2457-9: *Fruiant s'en vont tertrez et vau. Li uns l'autre n'atendi. A soi garir cascuns tendi*. On O. F. "antithetische Formen der Aufteilung": *li bas et li haut, li juene et li viel*, cf. Tobler-Lomm. I, p. xiv.—L. S.]

device, devoid of its original sense: it can hardly be supposed that the detachment of the enemy to be attacked should consist only of fathers and sons! Moreover, the example offers the same contrast of father and son that was contained in the line of Cairrel, and in the first passage cited from the Albigensian epic.

However the effect which is achieved in these two first examples by the device of 'splitting a group' is quite different from that apparent in the passages just quoted, in the verse of Giraut de Bornelh and those that follow the unity of the group or species is not really affected by the division; on the contrary, the splitting of the group or species only serves to emphasize its *uniformity*. But with the examples of the first type, though the members of a group are represented as taking part in the same action, still they participate not in an equal, but in an individual manner. If the poet says that in constructing fortifications of a town the father does not wait for the son to begin his work, he suggests to the reader that each person helping in that defense work does so according to his personal gifts and readiness. In such a case, then, I dare say, the splitting of the group or species means *differentiation*.

This method of contrasting members of the same group or species seems to me an excellent means of depicting their eagerness and competitive haste in setting to work. There is something dynamic in it that excellently fits the style of an epic poet. Indeed, all the examples which I could find of this sort of expression come out of epic poetry, the Albigensian chronicle being nothing but a series of contemporary events presented in the form of an epic poem,—of a *Chanson de Geste*. So, the phrase of the father not waiting for the son has the flavor of a popular saying. In so far, Appel was right. But, it seems to me, it is not based on a proverb, as Appel thought, but is one of those epic formulae in which the *Chansons de Geste* abound. At any rate, it can be supposed to have been well known to every one of the listeners of Elias Cairrel's Crusade Song, and this troubadour, employing it in a religious poem, raised it out of its epic rigidity. That Elias Cairrel, in his solemn song, meant his line: *Quar ges lo filh no-i deu atendre-l paire* to be interpreted in the religious sense of God the Father and the Son of God, there is no doubt whatsoever. But, clothing his religious thought in a well-known epic formula, he reached a double aim: he very efficiently put before the Emperor's eyes the

figure of God the Father and emphasized at the same time the urgency of his holy expedition. Or from the viewpoint of style, Elias Cairel, combining a religious thought with a Chanson de Geste expression, gave that religious thought a worldly, chivalric nuance—and in general the crusade songs naturally offer that mixture of religious and worldly things. At the same time, the poet revived a rather worn, stereotyped epic formula into a new poetical life.

KURT LEWENT

New York City

"POZOS DE NIEVE"

(NATURAL REFRIGERANTS IN SPAIN AND SPANISH AMERICA,
1500 TO THE PRESENT)

In the seventeenth century the use of *nieve* (meaning snow and/or ice) to chill drinks was widespread. Allusions to it abound in the *comedias* and in other poetry and verse. Julio Monreal in 1878¹ noted the fact in passing. Édouard Barry² adduced the earliest known testimony to ice-cooling, that of Pero Mexía; in his *Diálogos* (1547) he mentioned the custom and remarked that thirty years before "no había los extremos de agora, ni las invenciones de los salitres, ni nieves, ni los pozos, ni sótanos buscados en los infiernos." It remained, however, for Miguel Herrero-García to present a detailed and well documented account of the snow trade.³ He was able to describe the various methods of cooling drinks, by evaporation or by snow.⁴ He traced the growth of refrigeration in Spain from the days when it was a rich man's luxury till it was adopted by every class of society. About 1610 a Catalan, Pablo Xarqués, organized the ice trade in Madrid on a large scale, and he and his

¹ *Cuadros viejos*, Madrid, 1878, p. 209 and note 2. Monreal cited Tirso's *Marta la piadosa* and an *Epístola* of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola.

² Edition of *El burlador de Sevilla*, Paris, 1910, note to line 851.

³ *La vida española del siglo XVII. I, Las bebidas*. Madrid, 1933, pp. 145-176 and *Apéndices*.

⁴ It is of some interest to observe that the snow or ice was never put directly into the liquid. Melted snow was regarded as dangerous to health. Either the snow was packed around the container, or was itself placed in a bottle and lowered into the liquid.

heirs ruled it till 1645. Xarquies in Madrid, and other contractors in Granada, Lisbon, Seville, Murcia, Valladolid, Toledo, etc., brought the price within reach of the poorest. In summer even workingmen used snow regularly. Yet it is recorded that Carlos II spent 6,082 *maravedies* a day on snow for the royal household.

Most of the documents cited by Herrero-García concern the storage of *nieve* in the city (*pozos de nieve* for the dealer, private *pozos* or *paja* in the home), and the conditions of dispensing it. On the snow's journey from mountain to town we know little. It was transported on muleback, that is clear, since in 1642 the minor heirs of Pablo Xarquies complained to the city fathers of Madrid that they could not obtain "recuas y cabalgaduras en que conducir desde las sierras y ventisqueros a esta Corte nieves y hielos," and they asked to be allowed to commandeer seventy "cabalgaduras mulares" for the purpose. The alcaldes of Madrid granted them only forty.⁵ During the stay of Felipe IV in Sanlúcar de Barrameda in 1624 "traíanse cada día seis cargas de nieve de Ronda, en cuarenta y seis acémilas, repartidas en diferentes puestos, con que no paraba la nieve en ninguno."⁶ These witnesses do shed some light on the method of carrying the frozen water long distances: from the Sierra de Ronda to Sanlúcar is perhaps ninety miles, and from the Serra da Estrella to Lisbon⁷ about 120. But one would be glad to know more about the mountain end of the *nieve*: how many men were kept at the source of supply, how the stuff was packed for transportation (in *serones* covered with *paja*?), and whether it lay over nights, or was kept moving night and day, as one may infer from Pedro Espinosa's sentence above.

At the same period snow-cooling was practised also in Lima, Peru. Professor Irving A. Leonard has called my attention to passages in Juan Antonio Suardo's *Diario de Lima*.⁸ They are not widely known, and I give them in full:

II, 10-11: (Feb. 5, 1634) mataron a un negro, a medio día, cerca de la plaza; dicen que fué a caussa el concursso extraordinario que huuo a comprar nieve, por haver carecido della muchos días muchas perssonas en

⁵ Herrero-García, *op. cit.*, Apéndice 27.

⁶ Pedro Espinosa, *Obras*, ed. R. Acad. Esp., Madrid, 1909, p. 204. Cited by Herrero-García, 150-151.

⁷ Cf. *El burlador de Sevilla*, ed. E. Barry, line 851; ed. A. Castro, line 847.

⁸ *Diario de Lima de Juan Antonio Suardo* (1629-1639), 2 vols., Lima, 1936; ed. Rubén Vargas Ugarte.

esta corte, sin embargo de que el señor Conde Virrey ha dado muy discretas órdenes en orden a la repartición della, para que se haga a tiempo y con quietud y de manera que todos la alcancen.

II, 12: (Feb 18, 1634) por continuar todavía la falta de la nieve y estar esta ciudad muy fatigada por los excesivos calores, Su Excelencia, por su decreto, mandó volver al pregón el abasto deste género.

II, 13: (Feb. 28, 1634) y último día de Carnestolendas sobre la repartición de la nieve hubo competencia de palabras entre los alcaldes ordinarios, don Joseph de Rivera y don Fernando Altamirano y el señor Alcalde de corte mandó llevar preso a la cárcel a Gabriel Ordóñez, persona que tiene a su cargo el abasto de dicho género, pero aviéndose dado quenta del casso al Señor Conde Virrey que a la sazón estava en la chácara de Andrés de Rojas con la señora Condesa, passando la tarde, le mandó soltar y que se repartiese nieve a toda la ciudad.

II, 14. (March 4, 1634) sobre la repartición de la nieve, a medio día, hubo muchas cuchilladas.

II, 64: (Jan 25, 1635) la Justicia ordinaria mandó prender en sus casas con guardas a don Fernando de Avellaneda y a Alonso Bravo como fiadores de Gabriel Ordóñez en quien se remató el abasto de la nieve por no dar el necesario conforme tiene obligación, y al susodicho le mandaron depositar en el banco quatro mil patacones para traher a su costa nieve.

II, 65: Este día (Jan. 29, 1635) como a las doce, estando repartiendo nieve el alcalde ordinario don Antonio Gelder de Calatayud, cargaron tantos negros que para poder salir fué necesario que los alguaciles y porteros sacasen las espadas, de que resultó herir a algunos negros y ellos empezaron a tirar piedras, y con una de ellas dieron un golpe al dicho alcalde ordinario en un hombro, y a un alguacil otro en un labio de que quedó muy mal herido, y a los demás ministros dieron muchos mojicones y prendieron a quatro de los dichos negros, y luego *ipso facto* sin dilación alguna el dicho alcalde ordinario los mandó sacar por las calles acostumbradas y dar a doscientos azotes a cada uno.

II, 69: (Feb. 17, 1635) el alcalde ordinario, don Pedro de Vega, prendió en las Casas de Cabildo al Doctor don Diego Mesia de Zúñiga, abogado de esta Real Audiencia, con dos guardas por haber la noche antecedente quebrado las puertas de las cassas de la nieve y sacado un tercio de ella por fuerza, y los señores del Tribunal de la Santa Inquisición advocaron luego la causa en sí por ser el dicho Doctor don Diego, Ministro del dicho Tribunal.

II, 98: (Sept. 13 1635) por decreto de su Excelencia se pregonó una nueva Cédula de su Majestad en que manda que se venda por quenta de su Real Hacienda el abasto y estanco de la nieve para esta Ciudad con muy grandes preheminiencias y exempciones para la persona que lo comprare.

II, 104: (Nov. 8, 1635) se remató el abasto de la nieve por quenta de su Majestad en ocho mil y doscientos patacones cada año por seis y con veinte mil pesos adelantados, habiéndose primero consultado el negocio por el señor Virrey en el Real Acuerdo de Hacienda.

The lively diarist reveals that in Lima of the 1630's this branch of the art of gracious living flourished. *Nieve* was a necessity, not a luxury, and it was worth drawing a knife for. Suardo does not add to our knowledge of the means of transportation. The distance from Lima to the snowfields can only be conjectured; it can hardly have been less than one hundred miles.

All the data I have thus far cited refer to the period before 1650, and Herrero-García did not pass beyond it. There is no reason to suppose that the ice trade ceased after that date. The *Voyage d'Espagne . . . fait en l'année 1655*⁹ has this to say: ". . . sur le poitrail de son cheval estoient attachez . . . deux fourreaux de cuir bouilly où, au lieu d'armes, il avoit des bouteilles de vin qui se rafraichissoient par la glace qu'il y mettoit lorsqu'il les remplissoit; c'est pour cette raison qu'on nomme ces estuits de cuir-bouilly, *refreadores*." Mme d'Aulnoy in 1691 spoke of "eau glacée."¹⁰ The British Minister at Madrid, Alexander Stanhope, noted on Sept. 5, 1691, that the Queen was ill by reason of "eating lamb frozen with ice, which gave her a violent colic."¹¹

By the eighteenth century ice-cooling had ceased to be a novelty and no one bothered to mention it. Such at least is the inference I draw from the lack of allusions to it in the eighteenth and nineteenth.¹² Yet it does seem strange that the *costumbristas* should have passed in silence over the ice-trade when their *retratos* embraced almost every known type of Spaniard.¹³ The barest mentions in Larra, "agua de nieve" (*La fonda nueva*, 1833) and "leche helada" (*En este país*, 1833) may show that it existed, but an Englishman did testify that snow was cheap in his day, as we

⁹ Paris, 1665, ch. 36. Foulché-Delbosc plausibly ascribed this work to Antoine de Brunel.

¹⁰ *Relation du Voyage d'Espagne*, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, *Revue Hispanique*, LXVII, 1926, 480-481.

¹¹ *Spain under Charles the Second*, London, 1844, pp. 22-23. For this reference and other aid I am indebted to my colleague Professor R. K. Spaulding.

¹² Professor C. E. Kany's *Life and Manners in Madrid, 1750-1800*, Berkeley, 1932, contains no references to *nieve*.

¹³ Besides the well known writings of Larra, Mesonero, Serafin Estébanez and Antonio Flores, *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos* (Madrid, 1851) portrays 98 types, including *El aguador*, *El choricero*, *El portero*, *El ventero*, *La patrona de la casa de huéspedes*, etc. Any one of these could have brought in the matter of *nieve*, but none did.

know that it was under Philip IV.¹⁴ Mesonero Romanos adverted casually to the *pozos de la nieve* still existing in the old spot at the end of the Calle de Fuencarral.¹⁵ We know that mountain ice was used in Mexico at the same period.¹⁶

So far as Madrid was concerned, ice probably continued to be brought in on mule-back, or possibly with the aid of railways after they came in use. Refrigeration by ammonia or by carbonic acid began commercially in the 1870's and 1880's.

I will remind the reader that in the early nineteenth century cutting and shipping of ice was a great New England industry. Clipper ships laden with Maine ice packed in sawdust sailed to India, South America and California. This commerce reached its height in 1850-1870. After that, competition from Norway and artificial ice broke it down.¹⁷

Pozos de nieve still exist in some sections of South America. Sr. Luis Hernán Tejada-Flores, a Bolivian engineer, informs me that the hot agricultural valley of Los Yungas (elevation 6000 to 4000 feet) imports ice by automobile truck from the 14,000 foot *cumbre*

¹⁴ Richard Ford, *Gatherings from Spain*, new ed., London, 1851, p. 143: "Cold liquids in the hot dry summers of Spain are necessities not luxuries; snow and iced drinks are sold in the streets at prices so low as to be within the reach of the poorest classes."

¹⁵ "La calle de Fuencarral termina por su derecha con la extendida posesión donde están los *pozos de la nieve*." *El antiguo Madrid*, Madrid, 1861, p. 287.

¹⁶ George F. Ruxton, *Adventures in Mexico and the Rocky Mountains*, New York, 1848, p. 26: "The cuisine, being Spanish, was the best in the world, the wine good, and abundance of ice from Orizaba." He was writing of Vera Cruz, the year was 1846.

¹⁷ Interest in methods of transportation, of which we know so little for the pre-rail era, leads me to relate a curious incident that occurred in California in 1851. In September of that year the ice-ship failed to reach San Francisco on time. Heat in the Great Valley was intense, as usual. A Sacramento stage driver, "Baldy" Hamilton, gambled on the shortage. He drove a wagon-train ninety miles to Echo Summit in the Sierra Nevada, loaded the caravan with snow "packed in sawdust and green boughs," and with twenty armed guards started back to Sacramento. On the way down he was offered seventy-five cents a pound for the snow, but he rejected the bid, hoping to obtain a dollar a pound in the city. On his arrival in the capital he learned that the belated Boston shipment had arrived, and his snow could only meet its prices. He lost \$20,000 on the venture. (Edmund Kinyon, in the *Grass Valley Union*; quoted by The Knave, *Oakland (California) Tribune*, Sept. 23, 1941.)

of the road to La Paz. The countryfolk of the outlying villages buy the ice in 50-pound blocks called "panes," pack them in hay and bury them in the ground. Similarly, in New England, use of natural ice persists in localities where proximity to ponds brings the price below that of the artificial product.

University of California, Berkeley

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

THE BEGINNINGS OF FRENCH FIXED WORD ORDER

The difference in word order between Latin and Romance (or more precisely French) has been the object of many studies, some of which I have already discussed.¹ I have called attention to the twofold character of the problem. On the one hand, the customary arrangement of the Latin sentence: subject, object, verb, was gradually replaced in the Old French period by that of modern French: subject, verb, object.² On the other hand, the creation of fixed word groupings, a condition almost unknown to Latin, and specially characteristic of French, is directly connected with the passing of Latin into Romance in the VIII-IXth centuries. It is one of the phenomena that disrupted the umbilical cord which still connected the new *lingua romana rustica* with the mother tongue.

These fixed groups center around the two fundamental elements of speech: the noun and the verb. The first group to be thus formed was that of the noun. As a starting point for this new development,

¹ E. g. "On the Origin of French word order," *Romanic Review*, February 1939.

² Examples of the latter order in the Latin period are mostly either irrelevant or deceptive. A passage like the following: "*Cui respondit Dominus: Qui peccaverit mihi delebo eum de libro meo; tu autem vade et duc populum istum quo locutus sum tibi; angelus meus praecedet te. Ego autem in die ultionis visitabo et hoc peccatum eorum.*" Exodus, XXXII, 33-34, which Grandgent (*Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, 51) cites as an indication that a Romance order of words was already in existence in the fourth century, shows, on the contrary an order which is neither Latin nor French. Jerome was well aware of its strangeness when he said, Ep. LVII, v, that the order of words in the Bible is mysterious, but must not be interfered with.

we may consider the greatly extended use of *ipse* or *ille* which had come to represent merely a sort of syntactical accentuation.³ As evidence of this increased use, which is very noticeable in the texts from the sixth century on, is the fact that there are about four times as many occurrences of the demonstrative adjective in the "Liber Historia Francorum" (ca. 730) than in the "Historia Francorum" (ca. 580) and more than thirty times as many occurrences in the "Rule" of Chrodegang (ca. 750) than in that of St. Benedict (ca. 550) written in Italy.

But besides this numerical increase, another important event is taking place. The demonstrative, when subordinated to the function of the syntactical accent (that is to say, having no real demonstrative value, but merely serving to make the noun stand out), tends always to precede the noun directly. In its full, emphatic value, however, it practically always follows. Thus *ipse*, which was a purely accentuating particle, regularly preceded: *ad ipso monastirio fuerat concessa*; *ipsi agentis memorato Drogone*; *ipse Drogus*; *ipsa villa*; *de ipso Magnoaldo*; *ipsi Magnoaldus*; *apud ipso Berechario*; *ipsi agentis*; *ipsius vero Drogone*; *apud ipso Magnoaldo* (Lauer & Samaran p. 19, an. 697). Also in such stereotyped constructions as *in eo*, *illo*, *hoc tempore*, *anno* etc. (cf. *hoc anno* = O. F. *oan*), the demonstrative, without exception, precedes the noun in the "Liber." This phenomenon is comparatively recent, for it is not to be found in the Vulgate, in the "Peregrinatio," or in Gregory of Tours—in fact, not before the end of the seventh century. But in the emphatic demonstrative function, *ille*, without exception, follows the noun. A functional value is thus given to word-order: in the extreme cases of non-demonstrative value and unaccented demonstrative function, the demonstrative always precedes; in the extreme cases of demonstrative emphasis, it always follows. It seems clear therefore that in the former case, it has become a sort of secondary accent of the noun, similar to the accent on the initial syllable of a polysyllabic word. The noun, no longer rhythmically self-sufficient as it was in classical Latin, has all the more need of an adjunct, a sort of spring-board for the full effect of its increasing stress accent. The rhythmical element must have been an important cause in the production of this phenomenon: by the eighth century it has be-

³ See George Trager's thesis, *The Use of the Latin Demonstrative*, New York, 1932, p. 185 + *passim*.

come a general procedure to place the demonstrative, whatever its character, directly in front of the noun, whereas, from a purely functional point of view, the distinction earlier arrived at would seem a useful one to maintain. First *ille* is attracted into the fixed pre-position:⁴ "*Ille media pars cleri qui seniores fuerint annis singulis accipiant cappas novas. . . . Et illa alia medietas cleri illas veteres cappas quas illi seniores annis singulis reddunt accipiant et illi seniores illas cappas quas reddere debent non commutent*" (Chrodegangi Regula, ca. 750, Migne, 89, 1113); then follows *hic haec hoc*. The exceptions are of interest: the new emphatic (*il*)*lui*, (*il*)*lei*, taking the place, in the Merovingian formulae, of the "*Titius*," "*Maevius*" (John Doe) of Roman legal usage always follow: *ille venerabile lui* (so-and-so) *norae suae lei* (Marculf. Chrest. p. 192), and this needs no explanation. Again, *iste*, being for a while the emphatic synonym of *hic*, will also follow the noun: *hanc donatione ista* (Tardif, 59), *contra hanc epistola donationis ista*" (*ibid.* 68), a word order which survives in Spanish: *el hombre este*; and by analogy, *el hombre ese*, *el libro aquel*. And now the tendency towards fixed order extends to the new demonstrative-possessive *illorum* (*eorum*, *ipsorum*) that served to replace *suus* when the possessor is plural. Before the death of Charlemagne, the progress in the pre-position of *illorum* is manifest. The capitularies of the Frankish Kings for the first half of the ninth century will provide the best evidence, on account of their practical social and political character and their predominantly oral use which the drafters must never have lost sight of. In no. 73 (811), which is a short capitulary in ten paragraphs, out of eleven cases of the possessive *illorum* only two are placed after the noun: "*abbates et eorum advocati potestatem non habeant de eorum tonsis clericis . . . similiter et comites de eorum pagensis non habeant potestatem*" . . . (MGH, *Leg. Sect.*, II, 1). In No. 151 (*ib.* II, 2) of the year 825, all cases of *illorum* (*eorum*) in the possessive function (11 examples

⁴ Cf. Mario Pei, *The Language of the Eighth Century Texts in Northern France*, p. 198. "Only one case of *ille* following the noun against hundreds when it precedes." Notice that this same fixed order appears in all the genuine texts of the period, in the *Formulae*, the original documents of Tardif and Lauer and Samaran, in the original lives of the saints, *Vita Vedastis*, *Vita Eufronie*, *Vita Wandregisili*, in the *Polyptych* of Irminon etc. This shows it to be a fundamental evolution.

in 25 lines) appear before the noun; there is not a single case of post-position.

Note that for the same period, the Italian documents in the same collection are not so advanced (and, in regard to *illorum* = *loro* will never be). In no. 165 (825), although the demonstrative precedes in every case, the position of *illorum* is divided almost equally, four after, three before the noun (cf. It. *il loro libro*, *il libro loro*).

As the years go by, the possessive itself is attracted into this fixed grouping. In the French document no. 187 (*ib.*), the eight possessive adjectives appearing in the first 38 lines all precede the noun, while the three possessives appearing in the last 20 lines all follow; the possessive *illorum* precedes the noun in the section where the possessive precedes and follows where the possessive follows (three cases of each). In no. 196 (829), the possessive *illorum* used twelve times precedes the noun in every case.

In regard to the order of words, the Oaths of Strasbourg continue and confirm this evolution: demonstrative and possessive always precede. In fact, to my knowledge there are no cases of postposed demonstrative, and relatively few of postposed possessive, to be found in French. By now (ixth cent.) the new rhythm sufficiently rooted in the noun will complete itself by the creation of the group around the other basic word, the verb.

The entering wedge for the creation of the verb group appears to have been the fixing of the position of the pronominal adverb *ibi*. Classical Latin already used *unde* and *inde* as relative and personal pronoun respectively. The series was completed by the easy but necessary passage of *ibi* = "there" to *ibi* = "to it," apparent at this period: *De locis dandis ad claustra canonicorum facienda, si de eiusdem ecclesiae rebus fuerit, reddatur ibi* (= to the church) . . . (MGH CRF, I, 141, 819 p. 289). This adverb, relatively new in the pronominal function, is clearly the first to join the verb in a fixed order, so true is it that a new element is necessary to crystallize a tendency. This feature is to be observed best perhaps in the polyptych of Irminon (806) and those of Saint Peter of Corbie and Saint-Maur, on account of their practical, homely character. Besides the numerous *Habet ibi* (Sp. *hay*) we find many *Sunt ibi* (v. g. p. 283 Guérard 1844), *Solvunt ibi* (p. 284), *Dedit ibi* (p. 129), which order is without exception at the beginning of a sentence. But if an accented word begins the sentence, *ibi* will pre-

cede the verb: *si ibi cavaticarii* (p. 286), *ceteri coloni qui ibi se addonaverunt* (p. 290) *ut ipsum silentium . . . ibi servari possit* (p. 318). The only loose point would be in the inverted order *ibi se*.

In the case of *inde* (= *en*), however, regularity is not achieved so completely. By the side of the numerous *Facit inde* (v. g. p. 3), *Fodit inde* (p. 209), *Donat inde* (p. 209), *Solvit inde* (p. 149) (and, as can be expected, *Sed iste nihil inde facit* [p. 219], *Sed iste nihil inde reddit* [ib.]), one finds, exceptionally, it is true, *Inde facit* (p. 67), *Ipsi ministeriales habent inde singuli breves* (p. 306), *Inde sunt testes* (p. 159) and even *Et quicquid inde decimum edcreverit* (p. 326).

This different treatment may be explained by the fact that *inde*, like the other personal pronouns, could be either stressed or unstressed. In the latter part of the Vulgar Latin period, we witness the appearance of a series of stressed personal pronouns: *mihi, tibi, lui, lei, nobis, vobis, eis* (v. g. *scias certissime quia et ego mihi . . . volo tradere ad Dei servicio . . . Quod tibi in tantum suppleco . . . ut . . . me ancilla tua ad iugum Dei tradas* (Vita Wandreg. Chrest. p. 224. Cf. Pei, *op. cit.*, p. 167), by the side of the normal or classical pronouns (Cf. Oaths of Strasb. *in quant il mi altresi fazet . . . Deus sabir . . . me dunat*). When accented the pronoun was independent; unaccented, it was ready to fall under the influence of an accented word and be attracted to it. Although, semantically speaking, we feel that there was little in *inde* (= *en*) that could sustain accentuation, nevertheless, accentuation existed, as is proved by the reënforced synonym *exinde*, very frequently used at this period: v. g. *de Marietate ut primum omnium seniores semetipsos exinde vetent* (= *qu'ils s'en abstiennent* MGH CRF I, p. 153, an. 810), and by traces of the independent use of *en* in the oldest texts: *Et Ewruins ot en grant dol* (S. Léger 63). Similarly may be explained such post-posed groups as, e. g.: *Et Sancz Lethgiers oc s'ent pauour* (S. Léger 76); *Si ala s'en o tout son ost* (Alix. p. 57). Let us note also that *y*, in the pre-position, remains close to the verb in old French: *Ne il n'en i a mes nul tex* (Yvain 1237); *S'il en i eust V setiers* (ib. 3002).

It is not possible to follow the inclusion of the regular personal pronoun objects into the verb group during the first half of the ninth century because of the difficulty of interpreting the function of the personal pronoun, whether as accented or unaccented, since

the superficial correction of the texts has eliminated the Merovingian or Romance forms. Even much later, form alone could not always be decisive in determining the function: *Por quoi/fes le tu* (Yvain 1763), by the side of: *Porquoi m'asals?* (ib. 5130); *S'ait te Deus par sa grant vertu* (Resurrection 37); *La me pues tu moustrer?* (Alix. 13); *l'en ostez* (Yvain 5548); *Au soir appela l'oste et demanda li de la voie* (La Fille du comte de Ponthieu, 4); *Il apiela la dame et li demanda*. Yet the main basis for the verb group is attained by the time of the Oaths of Strasbourg.

A tempting question is why, in the verb group, the verb should have normally come first unless the group began with a word felt as having some sort of an accentuation; such an order is different from, is almost the reverse of, that of the noun group. A tentative answer might be that, besides the fact that rhythm as a live element calls for alternation, there is a semantic basis for normally placing the verb first; this seems to me to be suggested by Marouzeau's interesting studies on the word order in Latin. In Classical Latin the verb was usually placed first when used in an active, affective, dynamic manner, as in the imperative, or in the expression of a present or visualized activity (v. g. *BSL*, t. 38, 1937, xxii). In one short chapter of the *De Consolatione* of Seneca, consisting of less than thirty lines (II, 11), we find: *Vide quantum. . . . Dicet aliquis . . . Fleant . . . et gemant . . . Transeo . . .*, all first in the respective sentences, while in the narrative proper, the verb will more often take its place at the end of the phrase. That the former position of the verb must have been more decisive at this period in which the language served more for active than for contemplative or intellectual purposes is rather evident; this fact helped to determine the relative position of the terms in the fixed word order around the verb.

At any rate, in both aspects of the word order with the verb there were, to a certain extent, preserved and temporarily fixed, in a simplified, stylized and rhythmical manner, the two essential arrangements of words with the verb in Latin: *Falt li le coer, le helme li embrunchet* (Roland 2019); *Vint i Gerins . . . si i vint Berengiers* (ib. 795-6).

The system of fixed word order, barely indicated in Latin, thus made its appearance quite unobtrusively in the latter part of the sixth century by fastening together determinative and substantive

in a definite order. The growth was gradual: even as late as the twelfth century, the place of the determinative was not yet absolutely fixed: *Vit venir deiabiles mil* (S. Brendan 1466); *Deus ne . . . si ange tuit* (Perceval 394); *de rien nule* (ib. 1620); *espée nulle* (ib. 3157).

The principle of fixed word order extended more slowly to the ordinary and participial adjective whose position was for a long time unsettled: *e preiad que un menestrel bon li enveiait* (Les quatre livres des Rois [Koschwitz & Foerster, p. 201]); *sun mort amfant* [Alexis 429]; and Saint-Simon will still say: *à joints pieds* (*Mémoires*, t. 4, p. 399, Paris 1856).

This new rhythm which was destined to enjoy an extraordinary growth was introduced at a time when it seems certain that some of the Latin rhythm based on quantity still subsisted in the form of a rudimentary system of *clausulae* (Levillain, *Examen critique des chartes mérovingiennes et carolingiennes de l'abbaye de Corbie*, Paris 1902).

This survival concerning mostly the verb is perhaps cause and evidence that the principle of fixed word order did not affect the verb until after the beginning of the formation of the noun group—as is indicated by the evidence of the texts. In the early part of the ninth century the two poles of the system are established and its growth will henceforth characterize the new language, Romance.

Columbia University

HENRI F. MULLER

PASCAL AND THE MEDIEVAL DEFINITION OF GOD

"Qu'on ne dise pas que je n'ai rien dit de nouveau:
la disposition de matières est nouvelle."

Some years ago in commenting to a class on the *Tiers livre* of Rabelais, I remarked that Panurge's outburst, in the famous passage on debt (Bk. III, ch. IV): "Je me pers en cette contemplation" seems reflected in Pascal's conclusion, the essence of his *frisson métaphysique*: "Que notre imagination se perde dans cette pensée."¹

¹ *Pensées*, ed. Brunschvicg, art. 72. I have not studied the history of *se perdre*, which seems desirable if the comparison is to be regarded as valid.

My object now is to extend this observation to Pascal's well-known definition of the universe which precedes the quotation, given above, in the passage entitled *Disproportion de l'homme*. Here once more the thread that unites the French seventeenth century with the Middle Ages proper becomes apparent, and some remarks on the history of the definition may, I hope, be appropriate to a volume devoted to a distinguished American student of the French classical age.

All of my readers will recall Pascal's magic words:

Tout ce monde visible n'est qu'un trait imperceptible dans l'ample sein de la nature. Nulle idée n'en approche. Nous avons beau enfler nos conceptions, au delà des espaces imaginables, nous n'enfantons que des atomes, au prix de la réalité des choses. *C'est une sphère dont le centre est partout, la circonférence nulle part.* Enfin c'est le plus grand caractère sensible de la toute-puissance de Dieu, que notre imagination se perde dans cette pensée.²

It is obvious that the kernel of Pascal's thought is the phrase: "C'est une sphère dont le centre est partout, la circonférence nulle part"—the antecedent of *c'est* being *la réalité des choses* or *tout ce monde visible*, of which it is said we perceive only an "imperceptible flash."³ As for its origin, Brunschvicg refers us to Havet (ed. I, 17-19), who traced the definition back to Gerson, Bonaventura, and Vincent of Beauvais, the last of whom states (*Hist.* I, 1): *Deus est sphaera, cuius centrum ubique, circumferentia nusquam*, although Havet attributes the 'idea' to Trismegistos or Empedocles. There the matter rested until Abel Lefranc, finding the formula in Rabelais and Marguerite d'Angoulême,⁴ expressed the view that both of these authors had taken it from Nicolas de Cusa or Marsilio Ficino, because, he thought, Gerson, Bonaventura, and Vincent were scarcely read "dans les milieux lettrés du milieu du xvi^e siècle." While it is true that Marguerite refers to the

—cercle rond sans la circonference
Par tous costez egal sans difference,

² This, it will be remembered, is continuously inspired by the contrast between the macrocosm and the microcosm. In Rabelais, ch. III, pp. 46 ff., and ch. IV, pp. 51 ff., there is the same progression.

³ I interpret *trait* as *trait de lumière*; cf. *le soleil darde ses traits*, Eng. 'the sun darts forth its beams.' It may, however, include 'line' since the word alternates in the complete passage with *point*, *pointe*, *atome*.

⁴ Lefranc, *Grandes écrivains de la Renaissance*, pp. 170 ff.

which resembles the *Deum circulum, cujus centrum est ubique* of Nicolas (*De ludō globi*) or, indeed, the *Circulus spiritalis, cujus centrum est ubique, circumferentia nusquam* of Ficino (*Theolog. Platon.*), yet Rabelais, like Vincent and later Pascal, never refers to a 'circle' but to a 'sphere' in the well-known passage in Bk. III, ch. XIII (repeated in Bk. v, ch. XLVIII). He says:

Contemplation de ceste infinie et intellectuelle sphaere, le centre de laquelle est en chascun lieu de l'univers, la circonference poinct (c'est Dieu selonc la doctrine de Hermes Trismegistus).⁵

So that the line of descent was never interrupted, from the Middle Ages to Rabelais and finally Pascal. This conclusion is confirmed by the painstaking study of the formula made by Ernest Jovy in 1930.⁶ It is to this work that I now invite the reader's attention.

As Jovy shows, the attribute 'spherical' (Gr. *σφαῖρικός*, Lat. *conglobata figura*) represented to the Ancients "the perfect equality and absolute unity characteristic of God." Examples of the term occur in the writings of Parmenides, Empedocles, Plato (*Timaeus*) and Aristotle (*De Xenophane*).⁷ Hence it comes about that in

⁵ Lefranc's error is in part corrected in the note, p. 106, of the 1931 ed. of the *Tiers livre*. As for Trismegistos, his thirteenth dialogue with the translation by Turnèbe was published at Paris in 1555 (see Jovy, *op. cit.* below), and Symphorien Champier brought out a *Trismegista theologia* now lost. But the original Hermes Trismegistos refers to the Deity only as a 'circle' in a passage which as late as 1630 Rosselli, a Franciscan, glossed as follows (cf. also Voltaire's *Dict. philosoph.*, s. v. "Emblème"):

In hymno tertii decimi dialogi vocat Deum circulum immortalem, id est sphaeram infinitam cujus centrum est ubique quia ubique est, et circumferentia nusquam, quia scilicet loco non concluditur.

Jovy, *op. cit.* below, cites other instances of the same procedure. See also note 8 below.

⁶ Published in his *Études Pascalienues*, VII, the loan of which I owe to Professor Morris G. Bishop of Cornell. As Professor Spitzer reminds me, Friedrich Beck anticipated Jovy in his reference to Alanus in *ZRPH* 47 (1927), 4 ff., but in connection with Dante's *Vita Nuova* § 12 (*Ego tamquam centrum circuli*), not with Pascal. On the Dante passage, see further J. E. Shaw, *Essays on the Vita Nuova* (Princeton, 1929), pp. 95 ff., and Leo Spitzer, *Travaux du séminaire de philologie romane d'Istanbul*, I, p. 134. Beck quotes the passage from Alanus, but his references to the *Liber XXIV Philosophorum* and Trismegistus must now be controlled by the works I cite below.

⁷ In *Timaeus* 33 B the 'sphericity' corresponds to the model idea; cf. Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* I, 10, who refers us back to Plato. As to Simplicius' commentary on the *Physica* of Aristotle, see note 8.

Boethius (*Consolat.* III, 12, 103) we get the following explicit statement:

Ea est enim divina forma substantiae, ut neque in externa dilabatur, nec in se aliquid ipsa suscipiat; sed, sicut de ea Parmenides ait, πάντοθεν εὐκύκλου σφαίρης ἐναλγικιον ὄρχη.

Nevertheless, I believe it remained for Alain de Lille (Alanus ab Insulis) through his contact with Thierry of Chartres and with Cîteaux to give to the definition the form which it currently enjoyed in the Middle Ages and which survives in Pascal. This he did in the *Regulae* [or rather, *Maximae*] *theologicae*, where (Migne CCX, 627) he defines: *Deus est sphaera intelligibilis, cujus centrum ubique, circumferentia nusquam*, and then comments as follows: "How great a difference there is between the corporeal sphere and the intellectual. In the corporeal sphere the center, because of its smallness, can hardly be said to find itself in any place, and the circumference is considered to be in several places. But in the intellectual sphere, the center is everywhere, the circumference nowhere." Compare Bonaventura (ed. pub. at Mainz in 1609, VII, 325): *Sphaera intelligibilis, cujus centrum est ubique et circumferentia nusquam*, or Gerson (*Opera* I, col. 366-67): *quoniam tu velut sphaera intelligibilis cuius centrum ubique est, circumferentia nusquam*. The mention in these quotations of the 'intellectual sphere' indicates clearly the line of descent as far as Rabelais' *Tiers livre*. It could hardly have been on Vincent of Beauvais, therefore, that Rabelais drew.⁸

⁸ But Rabelais' reference to Trismegistus raises an interesting point, which I do not undertake to settle here. As C. Baeumker (*Beitr. zur Gesch. der Philos u Theol. des Mittelalt.*, xxv, fasc. 2, 1928, p. 201; cf. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosop.*, II, eleventh edition, esp. p. 247, and Baumgartner, "Die Philosophie des Alanus de Insulis," *Beitr.* II, fasc. 4, esp. p. 118) points out, the thirteenth century *Liber xxiv philosophorum*—a pseudo-hermetic treatise—is attributed in two MSS to Termegistus (Trismegistus). It was doubtless used by Meister Eckhart, who must have derived our formula from it. Moreover, Bonaventura [and Thomas Aquinas] in *1 Sent.* d. 37, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1 and 3, places the definition under the name of Termegistus (Trismegistus). On the other hand, Albertus Magnus—according to Baeumker—thought the name and the book a fiction and refers us back to the *Maximae theologiae* of Alain de Lille. Whether or not Rabelais knew the *Liber* is doubtful; his reference to *ceste infinie et intellectuelle sphaere* suggests that he was drawing on Meister Eckhart, who says (Denifle-Ehrle, *Archiv*, II, 571): *spera intellectualis*.

At the same time, neither Jovy nor Langlois,^{8a} editor of the *Roman de la Rose*, has noticed that Jean de Meung ingeniously employed his knowledge of Alain de Lille (and Plato) in his account of the Virgin Birth, beginning with verse 19124 of the poem:

Mais, senz faille, il est veirs que cele
A cui li ventres en tendi
Plus que Platons en entendi,
Car el sot des qu'el le portait,
Don au porter se confortait,
Qu'il iert l'espere merveillable
Qui ne peut estre terminable,
Qui par touz leus son centre lance,
Ne leu n'a la circonference;
Qu'il iert li merveilleus triangles

infinita, whereas Alanus, Bonaventura, Aquinas all have *sphaera intelligibilis* (see Baemker, *op. cit.*, p. 208, n. 8) as against the *Liber*, which reads: *sphaera infinita*. Sneyders de Vogel, *Neophilologus* 17 (1932), 212, holds that Rabelais' source was Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De proprietatibus rerum* I, 16. But Bartholomaeus reads: *spera intellectualis*, omitting *infinita*. At the same time, de Vogel is right in adding that Symphorien Champier's reference in 1510 to *une esphère inintelligible* owes its origin to the mistaken reading in the 1594 Venetian text of Bonaventura which has *sphaera inintelligibilis*, and which thus must have occurred in some earlier manuscript.

As for Vincent, Professor Ullman has been kind enough to give me the^{8b} following additional references from his rich collection on Vincent: *Nat.* I, 4—Helinandus: Empedocles quoque sic eum fertur diffiniuisse: "Deus est sphaera, cuius centrum ubique, circumferentia nusquam. Secundus quoque Philosophus ita: Deus est mens immortalis, incontemplabilis celsitudo, forma multiformis, incogitabilis inquisitio, insopitus oculus, omnia continens lux, bonum, et quid est huiusmodi." [According to Ullman, the quotation from Secundus is probably not from Helinandus but may be Vincent's own since he quotes it also in *Hist.* x, 71; it has frequently been printed, see *Philologus* 18 (1862), 529, and 46 (1888), 393; also Hilka, 88. *Jahrb. Schles. Gesell. vaterl. Kultur*, Breslau, 1910, I, IV.] *Hist.* III, 44—Hic est Empedocles qui sic Deum legitur descripsisse. Deus, inquit, est sphaera cuius centrum ubique et circumferentia nusquam. [Cf also *Doct.* V, 65, and see Buhler, *Speculum* 12 (1937), 441. The reference to Empedocles probably came indirectly from Simplicius, "Commentary on Aristotle's *Physica*," viii. i (250 b 23), p. 1124, line 1 (Diels, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, x, 1885):

τὸν σφαῖρον ποιοῦσαν, ὃν καὶ θεὸν ἐπονομάζει.]

^{8a} See, however, Sneyders de Vogel, *Neophil.* 16, 241, who is inclined to accept Bonaventura as Jean de Meung's source.

Don l'unité fait les treis angles,
 Ne li trei tout entierement
 Ne font que l'un tant seulement;
 C'est li cercles trianguliers,
 C'est li triangles circuliars,
 Qui en la vierge s'ostela.

The manner in which Jean de Meung completes his definition by including the Trinity has its echo later in Marguerite d'Angoulême, who joins to her description of the *cercle* this observation:

Le cercle suys dont toute chose vient,
 Le point ou tout retourne et se maintient,
 Je suys qui suys triangle tres parfaict.

* * * * *

L'éternel Dieu ou n'y a si ne mais,
 Pere puyssant du monde createur,
 Tres saige Filz du monde redempteur,
 Esprit tres saint le monde illuminant,
 Divinité, les troys en ung tenant—

a passage that recalls Dionysius the Areopagite, known to the Middle Ages mainly in the translation of John the Scot and to Marguerite probably in the translation of Ficino (1492). I quote the appropriate passages from the *De Divinis Nominibus* (*Dionysiana*, I, pp. 76, 86, and 223):

Ut in unitate divina, sive superessentialitate, unum quidem est uniprincipali Trinitati⁹ et commune: * *

Et hoc etiam commune et unitum et unum est toti Deitati, omnem ipsam totam ab unoquoque participantium participari, et a nullo iterum nulla parte; sicut rota [punctum] in medio circuli ab omnibus in circulo circumpositis rectis lineis, * *

Sicut quidam aeternus circulus, per optimum et ex optimo et in optimo et in optimum inerrabili conversione circumiens, et in eodum et per idipsum et perveniens semper et manens et revolutus.

It befitted the Neo-Platonizing sixteenth century to portray this idea pictorially, as in the wood-cut¹⁰ of the 1516 edition of the *Perlesvaus*, where the trinitarian triangle needs only to have a circle drawn about it in order to meet the requirements of the case.

⁹ If a text were needed to justify the idea of the triangle or Trinity "blending indistinguishably in the *sphaeros*," the Middle Ages had only to turn to *Timaeus* 53-54, of which John the Scot used the Latin translation and commentary by Chalcidius (see Manitius I, 336); cf. Paul Shorey, *What Plato Said*, p. 340.

¹⁰ Nitze-Jenkins, I, p. 12.

As for Pascal, he doubtless had occasion to consult Mlle de Gournay's edition of Montaigne (1635). That, I think, gave him his lead, for there he read in the preface: "Trismégiste appelle la Dêité cercle, dont le centre est partout, la circonférence nulle part." The reference to Trismegistos must have reminded him of Rabelais, whose *Tiers livre*, as I pointed out above, I think he knew. This is, of course, conjecture since Pascal could have derived his definition from one or more of the theological writers at his disposal. But sufficient has been said to establish that the famous definition stems from Alain de Lille. Thence it passed into the *Rose* and the works of Meister Eckhart, Bonaventura, Vincent, Gerson, Marguerite, and Rabelais—and the last named source was available to Pascal.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

University of California, Los Angeles

ANDRÉ GIDE ET LES PROBLÈMES D'INFLUENCE EN LITTÉRATURE

I

Il n'est pas de notion ou d'expression qui, plus que celle d'influence, soulève d'amères controverses et des incompréhensions acharnées entre les écrivains d'une part, les critiques ou les historiens de la littérature de l'autre. La faute en doit sans doute, dans une large mesure, être imputée aux critiques et historiens. Acharnés à sonder les recoins les plus obscurs du passé, ils se persuadent vite que tout a déjà été dit en ce monde et rien ne les chagrine comme d'avoir à saluer, dans une œuvre nouvelle, "prolem sine matre creatam." Ils confondent ainsi plus d'une fois rapprochement et source, affinité entre familles d'esprits et influence effective, antériorité et causalité. C'est évidemment faire grand honneur à tel écrivain d'aujourd'hui, qui ne passe point ses veilles dans la poussière des bibliothèques, que de le présenter comme l'héritier malgré lui de ce que quatre ou cinq littératures ont auparavant pensé. Mais bien des richesses du passé sont pour nous comme si elles n'existaient point, puisque nous les ignorons voluptueusement jusqu'à ce qu'un infatigable biographe découvre que nous les avons pillées sans vergogne. Aucune notion (si ce n'est celle d'évolution,

fréquemment interprétée selon un naïf finalisme imposant au développement des individus et des littératures la traversée d'une série de phases mystiques), n'a causé plus de ravages en histoire littéraire depuis un demi-siècle.

N'hésitons point à prononcer un humiliant *mea culpa*, si cela doit désarmer messieurs les auteurs et les engager, lorsque nous les étudions de leur vivant, à nous consentir sur leurs lectures, sur leurs admirations et leurs méthodes de travail des révélations qui, interprétées avec doute méthodique et saine méfiance, pourraient être des plus précieuses. Jusqu'ici, il en est peu qui n'aient ressenti une légitime irritation devant ces innocents jeux de patience, dans lesquels nous les classons en groupes et en écoles, et leur assignons des inspirateurs dont ils seraient les imitateurs, les plagiaires ou les fils naturels, c'est-à-dire spirituels. Il est normal sans doute que les auteurs ou, comme les critiques les appellent avec courtoisie, les créateurs soient comme tout ce qui est créateur ici-bas, femmes par plus d'un trait : ils ont donc quelque chose de l'aimable susceptibilité de ce sexe prétendu faible, dont les bouderies et les colères ont toujours été l'arme la plus efficace. Chacun sait combien il est peu galant de déclarer à une gracieuse compagne, "Comme vous ressemblez à Mme Une Telle," surtout si cette Mme Une Telle n'est ni Cléopâtre, ni la Pompadour, ni Greta Garbo. Il n'est guère moins grossier de proclamer devant un écrivain vivant qu'il a subi l'influence de tel auteur récent.¹ Plus l'influence a été réelle et profonde, plus l'écrivain s'acharnera à la dissimuler, comme la femme cachera plus soigneusement le poids de ses années si celles-ci ont déjà commis quelques outrages difficilement réparables.

Bien rares sont donc les écrivains assez intrépides pour éclairer sans perfidie la critique sur les influences qu'ils ont subies et les lectures qu'ils ont faites, sans craindre par là de prêter à l'historien malveillant ou étroit des armes faciles contre eux-mêmes. Notre siècle en a compté quelques-uns : Yeats, Gide, Rilke. Leur sincérité et leur honnêteté intellectuelle ont même été telles qu'elles risquent

¹ Tout au plus consent-il à admettre qu'on le rapproche d'Eschyle, de Shakespeare, d'Homère, de Goethe ou de V. Hugo. Claudel a rarement dédaigné d'être flatté par le parrainage des deux premiers de ces génies. Jules Romains accepte qu'on le rapproche des trois autres, mais non de Walt Whitman ou de Durkheim. (Voir sa préface de 1925 à la réédition de la *Vie Unanime*, NRF 1926.)

fort d'égarer les sourciers, à la fois érudits et naïfs, à venir. Ils ont affiché leurs admirations littéraires avec ce qu'un moderne appelle à propos de l'un d'eux, "misplaced intellectual loyalty,"² et dérouté ainsi pour longtemps ceux qui s'imaginent que l'on cesse d'être original dès que l'on se nourrit des autres.³

De tous, Gide est celui à qui la critique doit la plus vaste reconnaissance. Cet écrivain, l'un des plus personnels de son siècle, a accueilli avec délectation toutes les influences. Son histoire intellectuelle pourra un jour s'écrire par l'énumération des inspireurs étrangers qu'il s'est successivement donnés (sans parler de ses maîtres français depuis Montaigne jusqu'à Mallarmé) : l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, Virgile, la métaphysique de Schopenhauer, celle de Fichte et même celle de Leibnitz,⁴ Dante et Heine sont les lectures favorites de sa jeunesse.⁵ La découverte de la vie, au cours du voyage en Afrique du Nord, s'accompagne elle-même de la révélation de la poésie arabe et persane, de l'influence (en vérité fort limitée) d'Oscar Wilde et de la plus puissante de toutes, celle de Goethe. Peu après, ce sera (un peu plus tôt et un peu plus

² L'expression est de Richard Aldington, à propos de Yeats, dans "Farewell to Europe," *Atlantic Monthly*, octobre 1940, p. 519.

³ "Rien de plus original, rien de plus soi que de se nourrir des autres. Mais il faut les digérer. Le lion est fait de mouton assimilé." Cette pensée, qui pourrait être de Gide, est de P. Valéry, *Choses vues*, p. 31.

⁴ Nous avons été à même de questionner Gide sur ces influences étrangères subies par lui et de lui entendre affirmer celles qui pourraient paraître contestables, Fichte par exemple. Gide nous a confié cependant que l'influence de Leibnitz, si elle s'exerça, fut une influence à rebours. Il lut beaucoup Leibnitz, comme il lut Lessing, mais en guise de pensum, et avec l'obstination qu'il a souvent apportée à la recherche de ce qui diffère de lui et de ce qui lui est pénible et rébarbatif.

⁵ Dès ce moment-là, André Walter écrit dans son plan de conduite (*Œuvres complètes*, I, 43) : "Les influences certes nous modèlent; il les faut donc discerner.

Que la volonté partout domine: se faire tel que l'on se veut. Choisissons les influences.

Que tout me soit une éducation."

Gide n'a certes pas tort de dire que presque tout son développement futur était déjà préfiguré dans ses premiers livres. (Voir sa confession à R. Lalou dans le débat sur Gide du studio franco-russe, 5 avril 1930, *Cahiers de la Quinzaine*, 20^e série, no. 6.) Ces lignes révèlent dès 1891 quelle forte et courageuse volonté a toujours dissimulée la plasticité sinieuse de Gide.

pleinement que Gide n'a bien voulu le reconnaître), la profonde action de Nietzsche, celle de quelques autres Allemands comme Hebbel, et surtout celle de Dostoïevski. Après 1909, Gide, âgé de quarante ans, se mettra avec acharnement à l'étude de l'anglais et s'annexera une multitude d'écrivains d'outre-Manche et plus tard d'outre-Atlantique : Shakespeare, Keats, Fielding, De Foe, Dickens, Stevenson, Conrad, Meredith, et par dessus tous Blake et Browning. Il se refusera à partager l'admiration de son ami Du Bos pour Henry James, mais s'enthousiasmera pour Whitman et pour Melville, plus tard encore dévorera avec avidité Dos Passos, Hemingway et Faulkner.

En confessant et proclamant tant d'influences diverses, Gide a fait preuve, non de naïve faiblesse, mais de sûreté et de force. Très finement, il a compris que, dans ces contacts intellectuels comme dans certains autres, "there is safety in numbers," et que dix influences se contredisant ou se neutralisant sont plus fortifiantes et moins compromettantes qu'une seule qui risque de tout accaparer. La critique peut à juste titre saluer en lui un grand auteur qui, affecté d'une timidité incroyable et d'une faculté de sympathie prodigieuse, a pu communier avec les pays et les inspirateurs les plus divers, sans jamais perdre son âme parce qu'il n'était pas trop avidement préoccupé de la sauver.

Mais une instruction plus précieuse est renfermée dans les réflexions éparses que Gide a, au cours de cinquante années de vie littéraire, consacrées à ces problèmes d'influence, les plus périlleux que proposent nos études. La sagesse mesurée et saine des jugements critiques de Gide ne doit pas nous dissimuler leur originalité ; leur raison nuancée et perspicace, qui a fait de Gide, à ses heures, le premier sans doute des critiques de ce temps, ne doit pas nous empêcher de voir, en ce subtil adversaire des nationalistes maurrassiens et de l'enracinement à la Barrès, un critique de combat. Derrière son apologie persistante de l'influence, on devine plus d'une fois le lecteur agacé de telle petite revue d'avant-guerre où l'on croyait être le plus intégralement national, si l'on se fermait le plus hermétiquement à toute pénétration étrangère. Mais, alors même qu'il fait œuvre de circonstance et parfois de polémiste, Gide atteint à quelques vérités générales et peut-être éternelles, dont maint historien littéraire devrait faire son profit.

II

Tout d'abord, et comme devraient le faire ceux d'entre nous qui, hommes de cabinet eux-mêmes, se représentent tous les grands auteurs comme des Chateaubriand ou des Flaubert, composant à coups de fiches et puisant à de gros in-folios, Gide qui a beaucoup lu, trop lu sans doute,⁶ met au premier rang les *influences vécues*, et non les influences livresques :

J'ai beaucoup réfléchi à cette question des "influences" et je crois que l'on commet à ce sujet de bien grossières erreurs. Ne vaut réellement, en littérature, que ce que nous enseigne la vie. Tout ce que l'on n'apprend que par les livres reste abstrait. N'eussé-je rencontré ni Dostoïevsky, ni Nietzsche, ni Blake, ni Browning, je ne puis croire que mon œuvre eût été différente. Tout au plus m'ont-ils aidé à désemprouiller ma pensée. Et encore ?

Une femme aimée ou rêvée, la conversation d'un ami, la contemplation d'un nuage rosi par le soleil couchant, telle réflexion d'un garçon de café ou d'une femme de ménage (les lettres de Katherine Mansfield sont des plus révélatrices à cet égard) peuvent compter beaucoup plus, dans le mystérieux processus de la création littéraire, que la lecture de Shakespeare ou de Balzac. Mais, comme de telles influences ne sont qu'exceptionnellement et que très malaisément saisissables, l'historien des lettres préfère leur assigner la place de vagues inconnues, et s'en prendre aux autres, qu'il croit pouvoir mieux connaître.

Parmi les influences livresques proprement dites, les réflexions gidiennes nous amènent à distinguer plusieurs espèces. C'est d'abord l'influence mal assimilée qui se traduit par l'imitation pure et simple d'un modèle. C'est la plus fréquemment étudiée, et de beaucoup la plus négligeable, puisqu'elle ne s'exerce guère que sur les auteurs inférieurs ou sur les moins bonnes œuvres des auteurs originaux. Pour le reste, l'emprunt lui-même a peu d'intérêt, à moins qu'il n'ait été transformé, approfondi, repensé, donc à moins que la personnalité de l'influencé n'ait joué son rôle enrichissant. On devine que cette *influence par imitation* ne retient pas longtemps la curiosité de ce maître de la sincérité qu'est Gide. Il sait mieux que nul autre quelle est l'effrayante puissance de l'imitation dans la vie, et même de cette pâle imitation de nous-mêmes à laquelle nous nous livrons paresseusement après un certain âge.

⁶ Voir sur ce point ses aveux, *Journal* (Pléiade, 1939), pp. 1124, 1265.

"Certains êtres" écrit-il dans son *Journal* (p. 1054) "traversent la vie sans éprouver jamais un sentiment vraiment sincère; ils ne savent même pas ce que c'est. Ils s'imaginent aimer, haïr, souffrir; leur mort même est une imitation." De telles imitations ne paraîtraient pardonnables à Gide que comme des étapes juvéniles vers le grand idéal hellénique et nietzschéen: devenir celui que nous sommes.⁷

Autrement captivantes sont les natures sur lesquelles l'influence agit *par réaction, par protestation*, influences à rebours que nos disciplines n'étudient guère, et cela est dommage. Si l'on se modèle parfois sur ceux que l'on aime, il arrive aussi que l'on exaspère sa différence pour mieux s'opposer, l'un à sa femme, l'autre à un ami, le troisième à un collègue ou à un aîné.⁸ Qui dira combien Gide a dû, en bien ou en mal, à vouloir se dresser contre Barrès, ou combien le tragique angoissé de Mauriac s'explique par son désir de faire un roman catholique qui ne soit pas le roman à l'eau de rose de Bazin ou le roman bien-pensant à la Bourget? Ces influences à rebours sont souvent de toutes les plus fortes. On sait que nombre de jeunes gens orientent dans un certain sens leur vie entière, parce qu'ils veulent éviter de répéter les erreurs ou les ridicules de leurs parents. Repousser une influence est encore un moyen détourné mais infaillible pour la subir. "Ne cherchez donc pas à tout accueillir; repoussez. Souvenez-vous que le peuple hébreu tuait, mais ne convertissait pas. C'est toujours l'ennemi qu'on accueille." Ainsi s'est écrié Gide en 1900 dans un de ses paradoxes assurément les moins goethéens.⁹ En 1938, il ajoutera avec un humour renanien que son meilleur disciple est probablement Henri Massis. "L'influence que j'ai pu souhaiter est toute émancipatrice; c'est d'encourager chacun dans son sens, et de différer de moi le plus possible."¹⁰ Ou encore, autre forme de réaction que Gide a beaucoup pratiquée, nous découvrons chez un auteur quelque idée que nous portions en

⁷ C'était la devise grecque de Nietzsche: *Ἐνὸς ὁλὸς ἔσσι*. L'un des plus gidiens parmi les jeunes romanciers, Julien Green, note dans son *Journal* (Plon, 1938, I, 7): "La sincérité est un don comme un autre. N'est pas sincère qui veut."

⁸ *Journal*, pp. 902-903. Nietzsche a glissé, dans sa *Volonté de puissance* cet aveu curieux: "Socrate, il me faut l'avouer, m'est si proche, que je suis constamment en lutte avec lui."

⁹ Dans "Paradoxes," *Œuvres complètes*, II, 473.

¹⁰ Dans "Feuillets," *Œuvres complètes*, XIII, 444.

nous, que nous allions nous-mêmes exposer. Vexés d'avoir été prévenus, nous décidons de taire cette vérité rencontrée ailleurs, peut-être ailleurs plus fortement traduite, et nous accentuons ou exprimons de préférence un autre aspect de nous-mêmes. C'est ainsi que l'*Immoraliste* était déjà à demi composé lorsque Gide fit, nous dit-il,¹¹ la connaissance de l'œuvre nietzschéenne. Il crut donc pouvoir alléger son livre d'un lourde part de discussion théorique pour aller dans le sens du roman ou du récit épuré.¹²

La critique fait fausse route lorsqu'elle conclut de toute ressemblance entre deux auteurs à une influence, ou lorsqu'elle confond influence et ressemblance. Beaucoup plus souvent, l'influence est une *autorisation*. Gide tient fort à cette notion, qui explique en effet sa perpétuelle obstination à proclamer ses lectures, à se mettre à l'abri de tel grand écrivain étranger, alors qu'en vérité il s'exprime lui-même. Le grand timide qu'il fut toujours, hardi à ses heures et ami du scandale comme seuls les timides savent l'être, a été renforcé dans sa vérité tardivement et joyeusement trouvée par l'exemple de prédécesseurs à l'abri desquels il s'est placé. Il est clair que toute une partie de ses goûts littéraires (sa curiosité pour Winckelmann, pour Walt Whitman, pour les Grecs eux-mêmes, pour le *Hero and Leander* de Marlowe) s'explique par le même souci de justifier son anomalie physiologique qui lui fit, dans *Corydon*, accumuler les preuves empruntées à l'histoire naturelle. Ailleurs, dans Blake, dans Dostoïevski, c'est lui-même qu'il a recherché et c'est lui-même qu'il dépeint dans son ouvrage sur le romancier des *Possédés*—son "livre-charnière,"¹³—comme le peintre trace involontairement tous les traits de sa propre physionomie spirituelle en croyant interpréter fidèlement son modèle. Il arrive d'ailleurs que cette influence par autorisation ou par libération couvre d'égoïstes sophismes. "Que de Werthers secrets s'ignoraient qui n'attendaient que la balle du

¹¹ C'est du moins ce qu'affirme Gide dans son *Journal*, p. 859, dans son intéressante lettre publiée en tête du livre d'Elsie Pell sur Gide, à Grenoble, en 1935, et dans *Œuvres complètes*, XIII, 441. Il est permis de mettre en doute ici la sureté de sa mémoire.

¹² Comme cela est si souvent le cas chez Gide, un précepte esthétique est la contrepartie d'un précepte de morale. On songe au proverbe de Blake, si cher à Gide: "If others had not been foolish, we should have been so." On lit déjà dans la *Digression sur les anciens et les modernes* de Fontenelle: "Il y a je ne sais combien de sottises que nous dirions si elles n'avaient pas été dites."

¹³ R. Lalou, *André Gide* (Strasbourg, Heissler, 1928), p. 22.

pistolet de Werther pour se tuer !” Il est vrai, et c’est dans cette autorisation demandée à de plus grands ou à de mieux doués que nous (*Journal*, p. 723), à des génies qui peuvent, mieux que nous, s’arroger le droit de vivre par delà le bien et le mal, que gît le péril de certaines influences néfastes.

Enfin, l’influence est fréquemment aussi un stimulant, un encouragement, une *confirmation*. “Entre gens de lettres,” a écrit Stendhal dans une petite phrase qui va loin, “tout éloge est un certificat de ressemblance.” La rencontre de Dostoïevski ou de Browning a non seulement fourni à Gide quelques autorisations—elle l’a encouragé dans une voie où il tendait déjà.¹⁴ Elle l’a aidé à voir plus clair en lui, à discerner ses directions futures, comme l’exemple quotidien d’un frère aîné nous éclaire sur celui que nous deviendrons, ou comme la mère de la jeune fille à marier avertit par avance le fiancé de ce que sera, dans quelques lustres, la vierge fluette et soumise qu’il courtise. Tel livre, telle sonate provoque en nous un choc violent, un ravissement quasi physique. C’est que l’œuvre ainsi découverte nous révèle soudain à nous-mêmes. Dans sa conférence de 1900 sur “l’Influence en littérature,” (*Œuvres complètes*, III, 257), Gide disait déjà :

On les a comparées [les influences] à ces sortes de miroirs qui nous montreraient non point ce que nous sommes déjà effectivement, mais ce que nous sommes d’une façon latente.

Ce frère intérieur que tu n’es pas encore, disait Henri de Régnier. Je les comparerai plus précisément à ce prince d’une pièce de Mæterlinck qui vient réveiller des princesses. Combien de sommeillantes princesses nous portons en nous, ignorées, attendant qu’un contact, qu’un accord, qu’un mot les réveille . . .

III

L’œuvre critique de Gide, et en vérité son œuvre tout entière, est, dans ses profondeurs une apologie de l’influence intelligemment conçue.

Des *Nourritures terrestres* aux *Faux-Monnayeurs*, Gide a fréquemment entonné son cri d’iconoclaste : “Familles, je vous hais !” Au-delà de la famille et de sa prison cellulaire, il nous enseigne à haïr tout ce qui est trop proche ou trop voisin de nous. Sa subtilité recherche les énigmes et les problèmes toujours complexes que pose la compréhension d’une pensée qui n’est pas celle de notre pays ou

¹⁴ Gide fait une remarque analogue à propos de Blake, *Journal*, p. 752.

de notre milieu. Un passage de *Si le grain ne meurt* (*Œuvres complètes*, x, 370) le confesse :

Je ne puis mieux comparer l'exotisme qu'à la reine de Saba qui vint auprès de Salomon "pour lui proposer des énigmes" Rien à faire à cela : il est des êtres qui s'éprennent de ce qui leur ressemble, d'autres de ce qui diffère d'eux. Je suis de ces derniers : l'étrange me sollicite, autant que me rebute le coutumier.

Certains nationalistes étroits, comme la France en a compté en ce siècle, reprennent à leur manière le "Comment peut-on être Persan?" Ils redoutent, en accueillant un auteur étranger, d'avoir à bouleverser leurs habitudes casanières, de perdre une personnalité apparemment trop pâle ou trop malade pour assimiler ce qui diffère d'elle. Leur prudence est aveu de faiblesse. "On ne triomphe bien que de ce que l'on s'assimile," leur réplique Gide. (*Journal*, 733.)

Les influences étrangères sont donc bienfaisantes, d'après cet écrivain qui les a avidement accueillies, parce qu'elles sont l'étrange, le nouveau, l'énigmatique. Mais elles sont aussi la pente à remonter, la lutte contre notre insidieuse paresse, en un mot, la difficulté. Leur valeur est morale autant qu'esthétique, et d'autant plus précieuse par là aux yeux de ce moraliste protestant qui a prononcé dans son admirable *Philoctète* (acte IV, scène II) : "Ce que l'on entreprend au-dessus de ses forces, voilà ce qu'on appelle la vertu." Un Français, de par sa naissance et son éducation, a déjà dans son sang et dans sa cervelle les écrivains de son pays (*Journal*, 1277). Faible est son mérite à ressentir spontanément le charme de Descartes, La Fontaine ou Verlaine. Shakespeare, Whitman, Dosztoievski sont pour lui moins charmants. Justement, "Tout ce qui m'est charmant m'est hostile."¹⁵

Perpétuellement assoiffé de palingénésie, Gide a encore recours à l'étranger pour mieux se connaître et se renouveler plus sûrement. Les littératures les moins vigoureuses, se repliant sur elles-mêmes, crouissent dans une monotone et paludéenne stagnation. Les plus vaillantes puisent périodiquement dans le recours à l'étranger le ferment vivifiant qui leur permet de se dépasser elles-mêmes et de créer du neuf. Plus que toute autre, la littérature française, volontiers artiste et formaliste, a besoin de ce recours à l'étranger ; plus que pour toute autre, ce recours a, chez elle, été admirable de fécondité. Dès 1920, dans une conférence sur Verhaeren (*Œuvres complètes*, x, 7), Gide déclarait :

¹⁵ *Œuvres complètes*, II, Introduction à *Saül*.

En France, la forme triomphe toujours et de tout, parce que le peuple français est le peuple le plus artiste de l'Europe; et le danger . . . , c'est que cette forme n'en vienne à se figer, à devenir formule; et ce serait la sclérose si, périodiquement, ce que les nationalistes considèrent comme un virus étranger ne venait provoquer une de ces palpitations puissantes, par quoi notre poésie se trouve toute revivifiée

L'écrivain le plus largement et le plus diversement influencé est souvent aussi le plus original: telle est donc la première conclusion, déjà bien des fois vérifiée depuis Chaucer et Molière, que nous propose l'œuvre critique de Gide. Car le peuple jeune ou l'artiste vigoureux possède un appétit capable de tout dévorer, un estomac à même de tout assimiler. Dans un curieux passage retranché de la rédaction définitive de *Si le grain ne meurt* et cité dans le *Dialogue avec André Gide* de Charles Du Bos (Au Sans-Pareil, 1929, p. 69), Gide affirmait, à propos des influences étrangères, qu' "un cerveau bien français est fait pour les supporter toutes. . . . Tout cela part, bien entendu, de la puissance de digestion de la cervelle. La mienne eût digéré des cailloux."

Et la seconde conclusion devrait être sans doute: l'écrivain le plus cosmopolite est aussi le plus national, et d'autant plus universel qu'il est plus national. Stendhal, Baudelaire, Proust, Claudel que tant de sots critiques avaient accusé de n'être pas français, Rilke successivement soumis à l'influence de trois ou quatre pays étrangers, Pouchkine, tous écrivains si profondément nationaux, ont confirmé cette vérité à laquelle atteint toute réflexion prolongée sur les problèmes d'influence. L'écrivain nationaliste se préoccupe d'accroître ses différences et d'exprimer cela seul que d'autres littératures dissimulent (*Journal*, 781); l'écrivain vraiment national traduit, derrière les différences, ce qui est largement humain. "De tous les auteurs français," écrit de Gide un admirateur allemand,¹⁶ "il est celui qui offre le plus de traits allemands et anglais." Affirmation fallacieuse. S'il est anglais, allemand ou russe, n'est-ce pas surtout parce que Gide, pour s'être confronté avec quatre ou cinq cultures étrangères, n'en est devenu que plus profondément français, et par là même plus séduisant et plus représentatif pour le lecteur étranger épris des œuvres françaises les plus largement humaines?

HENRI PEYRE

Yale University

¹⁶ Klaus Mann, "Influences françaises," *Cahiers du Sud*, novembre 1938, p. 755.

LA ESPADA Y LOS TIEMPOS DE LA VIDA EN
LAS MOCEDADES DEL CID

Desde el siglo xii al xx, perdura invariable en la literatura española a través de las páginas de los mejores, un tintineo de espadas. Rastrear con exactitud y pormenor esta presencia constante en nuestras letras me parece que, lejos de resultar en vano acopio de papeletas sin alma, daría en sorprendentes hallazgos psicológicos. Hasta que un erudito, con algo más que erudición, consagre sus afanes a esa tarea, permítasele a cualquier lector, a mí, hoy, acudir con un mazo de notas al ojeo de este tema. Doy a continuación las que me ha sugerido la lectura de *Las mocedades del Cid, Comedia primera*.¹

El vocablo "espada" se da en la comedia poco más de cuarenta veces. Pero no voy a estudiar todas y cada una de sus ocurrencias; me limitaré a unos pasajes en que la espada es escogida por el poeta para expresar, en torno a su realidad de objeto único, tres estados vitales del hombre, tres actitudes típicas de la adolescencia aun agraz, la juventud sombreada de virilidad y la vejez.

En la escena I del acto primero, se representa, como todos recordarán, la ceremonia de armar caballero a Rodrigo. Asiste a ella el joven príncipe Don Sancho que, envidioso de la suerte del novel armado, pregunta a su padre:

Padre; y cuando podré yo
ponerme una espada al lado?

Al contestarle el rey que aun no es tiempo, porque sus años son tiernos y la espada habría de parecerle pesada, el doncel se lanza a un fogoso trozo lírico:

Ya desnuda o ya envainada
las alas del corazón
hacen ligera la espada.
Yo, señor, cuando su acero
miro, de la punta al pomo,
con tantos bríos le altero,
que a ser un monte de plomo
me pareciera ligero.

¹ Cito por la edición de G. W. Umphrey, Holt, 1939.

He aquí, bullentes, encendidas, todas las impacencias e ilusiones del mozalbete en el umbral de vivir. El rey, su padre, da por decirlo así, el núcleo del enfoque poético del tema al hablar de la *pesadez* de la espada. ¿Qué opone el garzón a esa pesadez, inevitable mandato del mundo físico? En primer lugar "las alas del corazón," por lo que no ha de entenderse otra cosa sino ese aletear, dentro del pecho de un mancebo, de energías aspirantes, de ímpetus aun retenidos, mal tascados. ¿Qué importa, dice en el segundo párrafo, que la espada sea "un monte de plomo," exagerando así la idea de la pesadez? El la infunde, al mirarla, sus bríos. Y el efecto mágico, carga en una palabra: *altero*. Porque los bríos del mozo son tales que la natural calidad grave del arma se cambia, se muda, se *altera*, al verse sometida a su influjo. He ahí el eterno y maravilloso engaño de la primer juventud, en que los volúmenes más duros y resistentes del mundo se aparecen, a la pujante vida que empieza, moldeables y plásticos, y en que la existencia es horizonte de una totalidad infinitamente posible. Es este el primer tiempo de la vida expresado por Guillén de Castro por el expediente de la espada.

El segundo lo personifica el propio protagonista de la comedia. Al ser armado caballero por el monarca éste le dice que le entrega espada con la que ganó cinco batallas campales. Rodrigo, con uno de esos característicos prontos que nacen a su figura literaria en el poema de las Mocedades, y que le eran tan ajenos en el *Cantar*, repone que para honrar arma tan ilustre la quitará de su cinta y la colgará en su esperanza, jurando no volver a ceñírsela hasta haber vencido, él mismo, otras cinco batallas campales. En la escena segunda al despojarse de las armas, ya en su mansión, repite ante sus hermanos el juramento. Con sumo acierto poético usa Guillén de Castro la metáfora de descolgarse la espada del cinto y colgarla de una esperanza. Porque la imagen lleva implícito su reverso psicológico: que es tener una esperanza pendiente de una espada. Obsérvese que dos valores, correspondientes a dos mundos distintos, una esperanza de vencer, de cumplir su destino de héroe, trémulo y soberbio valor del reino de la conciencia, y una espada, la espada real entregada a Rodrigo por el monarca se someten, en virtud del juramento y de la metáfora, a una mutua dependencia: la esperanza de ceñirse *esta* espada reside en otra espada con la que el joven Rodrigo logre ganar las cinco contiendas; y esa ilustre espada,

recién transmitida al joven caballero por el rey Alfonso, está pendiente a su vez de algo impalpable e imponderable, de una esperanza. Aun tiene otro sentido ese acto de Rodrigo al jurar no colgarse la espada al costado mientras no venza cinco combates en campo abierto: la espada sirve de centro de referencia, más simbólico que material, a uno de los más nobles movimientos de toda alma noble en el arranque de la juventud: el pacto que hace el ser humano con su voluntad hazañosa, la promesa consigo mismo de realizar algo descomunal y heroico. Nadie vió mejor que los románticos este hervir dentro de los pechos de pasiones disparadas hacia metas altísimas, esta mezcla de arrogancia e inocencia, ese anhelo de descollar o morir, típico más que de otras edades de la vida, de la mocedad. El pasaje que comentamos, y su cristalización en torno a la espada da perfecta corporeidad poética a ese estado humano.

Al final de la misma escena segunda, Rodrigo, ya resuelto a vengar la afrenta sufrida por su padre echa mano a una espada que se guardaba en su casa, arma de abolengo preclaro, ya que perteneció a Mudarra, el héroe de la leyenda de los infantes de Salas. Este pasaje está tomado por Guillén de Castro de un romance, incrustado en la obra con perfecta adecuación de tono. En él Rodrigo acepta todo el compromiso que supone el ceñirse la espada de un héroe famoso, y dirigiéndose a la espada, en figura de personificación, como si le pudiera oír y entender, dice:

Bien sé que te correrás
de venir a mi poder
más no te podrás correr
de verme echar paso atrás . . .
. . . segundo dueño has cobrado
tan bueno como el primero.
Pues cuando alguno me venza
corrido del torpe hecho
hasta la cruz, en mi pecho
te esconderé, de vergüenza.

Notable es, en primer término, el tratar a la espada como ser vivo, haciéndola testigo de la promesa; y lo que es más, juez de su incumplimiento, ya que la ofrece matarse con ella, si llegara a quedar vencido. Se acumula así en la espada una serie de significados, en que se entretajan lo moral y lo material: la espada objeto de la promesa, testigo de la misma, y si fuera menester ejecutora material del castigo de muerte que cumple al deshonrado por la derrota.

Pero además la espada en este caso sirve de expresión a otra fase del estado de juventud: la aceptación voluntaria y entusiasta por el hombre mozo de su papel de continuador de una tradición de esfuerzo y heroísmo. Sí, la nobleza obliga. La circunstancia de recibir acero del rey, y de usar otro del antiguo héroe Mudarra ligán a este mancebo, recién salido a la vida, con un linaje de hombres que vivieron antes que él, y cuyos destinos de excepción él ahora se apresta a continuar con su persona, demostrando así su conciencia de pertenecer a algo más que a un circunscrito destino individual. Y es, otra vez, la espada, la que le pone en comunicación con ese complejo de valores psicológicos y morales: la vida del caballero como deber de proseguir cumpliendo un repertorio de normas de honor y sacrificio, heredado de gentes de su sangre y su tierra.

El último tiempo de la vida humana, la senectud, se ejemplifica en Diego Laínez, el padre de Rodrigo, y en aquella escena segunda del acto primero en que regresa a su casa abrumado por el pesar de la ofensa recibida del Conde Lozano, que le abofeteó ante el Rey. En un patético monólogo, el buen viejo excitado por sus propias encendidas palabras arroja de sí el báculo en que se apoyaba, y que quedó roto, y decide tomar una espada para vengar su honor. Así lo hace:

En tí, en tí, espada valiente
ha de fundarse mi honor.

Pero apenas comienza a blandirla siente su peso. Su sangre hierve en sus venas, sí. Pero al brazo le falta la fuerza requerida para servir ese fuego interior.

Ya me parece de plomo,
ya mi fuerza desfallece,
ya caigo, ya me parece
que tiene a la punta el pomo.

El noble Diego pierde toda esperanza de vengar su honor por propia mano, y sobre él cae el desaliento, al darse cuenta de que ya las fuerzas físicas traicionan a los poderes del alma.

¡Oh caduca edad cansada!
Estoy por pasarme el pecho.
Ah tiempo ingrato ¡qué has hecho?

Fijémonos en que lo que el poeta trata de trasmitirnos es la repentina revelación que un hombre tiene de su caducidad física, de su

impotencia para valerse por sí mismo en trance de tanta monta como el vengar su honor. Es el imperio de la vejez, la victoria del *tiempo ingrato*, que somete a su yugo los afanes más nobles del hombre. Y ese tremendo momento de reconocer el propio acabamiento, de encararse con la realidad de que ya no se es el mismo, se transmite poética y dramáticamente al lector por medio del símbolo de la espada. A ella apela Diego Laínez, descolgándola del muro, blandiéndola, en prueba de que sus bríos interiores, su fuerza de alma, le permitirán usarla, aun. Pero ella, muda e inexorablemente, por la terrible persuasión de su mucho peso material, revela a Diego su senilidad, su ingreso fatal en ese último estado de la vida humana. Se nos vienen a la memoria ahora las palabras del joven príncipe Don Sancho, en la escena primera, sobre como "las alas del corazón hacen ligera la espada." Sí. Lo que Don Diego siente ahora, sin remedio, es que ya no hay alas en el corazón, para levantar ese peso de la espada.

Y así se cierra ese ciclo que queríamos comentar, en que el poeta, sirviéndose siempre de un mismo objeto, la espada, nos ha comunicado tres fases muy distintas de las edades reales y psicológicas del hombre. En suma, el drama del vivir, desde su alba a su ocaso. La espada, objeto material, arma de lucha, pasa, en la poesía a la categoría de un objeto-símbolo, demostrando su capacidad de expresar sentimientos muy diversos de los tiempos de la vida. Díjese que el limpio metal de su ancha hoja sabe reflejar, a más de las formas del mundo de afuera, las fugitivas, leves imágenes de lo que pasa por los adentros del alma del hombre.

Yendo dedicado este artículo al homenaje a un gran historiador del teatro francés, permítaseme añadir, como apéndice, algo sobre la suerte que ha corrido este tema de la espada en *Le Cid* de Corneille. El poeta francés, en su labor de simplificación de elementos, suprimió la escena primera de *Las Mocedades del Cid*, y por consiguiente el pasaje sobre la espada puesto en boca del príncipe Don Sancho. Igualmente prescinde del romance de la escena tercera en que Rodrigo promete a su espada no dar, paso atrás, o matarse con ella, caso de ser vencido. Sólo queda el tema de la espada en las palabras de Don Diègue, escenas IV, V y VI, y eso con un dramatismo muy atenuado en relación con el famoso monólogo de Diego Laínez, de la obra española. Y en otras palabras de Don Rodrigue, en la escena VII, donde interroga al acero pre-

guntándole si le ha sido dado para vengar su honor o para perder a su Jimena. El empleo de la espada como objeto-símbolo de tres edades del hombre queda, pues, excluido de la tragedia francesa, esa "conversation sous un lustre" de la cual deben quedar eliminados los arrebatos líricos que pudieran oscurecer el contorno esquemático del dibujo de las pasiones.

PEDRO SALINAS

LES DANGERS DU CLICHÉ LITTÉRAIRE : LE DR.
JOHNSON ET JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU ¹

Ces deux contemporains, la postérité s'est plu à les placer aux antipodes l'un de l'autre. L'accord de leur philosophie—sans parler même de leur personnalité—paraît avoir échappé même à des commentateurs sous la plume desquels on se serait le plus attendu à le voir signalé : Macaulay, Carlyle, Leslie Stephen, et jusqu'à Tinker et Alf. Edw. Newton. Et pourtant, c'est presque l'œuf de Colomb.

Commençons par dire que cette attitude négative s'explique un peu—sans toujours se justifier. En ce qui concerne la France, on n'y connaît guère le Dr. Johnson, ou plutôt quand on le connaît c'est par l'éreintement vigoureux dans *l'Histoire de la littérature anglaise* par Taine—auquel s'est à peu près rallié Dottin en 1911 (A. Colin), et qui n'a été amendé que récemment par Legouis et Cazamian (Hachette, 1928). Peu des écrits de Johnson d'ailleurs ont été traduits : les essais du *Rambler*, ceux de l'*Idler* et quelques vies de poètes. *Rasselas* avait été mieux connu, mais de nos jours il ne l'est guère ; la dernière traduction est de 1886, par Baudry, et semble avoir eu peu de succès. Et par parenthèse, on peut discerner déjà ici un malentendu : ceux qui se sont occupés de Johnson en France ont jugé l'écrivain et le critique dont l'attitude a toujours été celle d'un classicisme périmé ; or, de Johnson qui avait le funeste pouvoir parmi ses contemporains de faire ou défaire une réputation d'un coup de plume, Garrick déjà disait : "Quand Johnson commence à écrire la passion dort et la déclamation commence à ouvrir la bouche." Ce n'était pas un Boileau qu'il fallait chercher en Johnson, mais un Rousseau.

¹ Ces pages font suite à une étude sur la superstition du cliché littéraire, qui a encore une si grande emprise sur notre critique—dans nos livres et dans nos cours.

Quant à l'Angleterre, où, pas davantage qu'en France, on n'a songé à établir de lien entre les deux hommes, c'est à Johnson lui-même qu'en revient avant tout la responsabilité. Sans guère connaître de Rousseau, paraît-il bien, beaucoup plus que le *Second Discours*,¹ c'est-à-dire l'écrit avec lequel on associe la théorie de la supériorité de l'homme de la nature sur l'homme civilisé, il a lancé contre lui la fameuse boutade rapportée par Boswell:

Our next meeting at the Mitre was on Saturday the 15th of February [1766], . . . I had mentioned that I had passed some time with Rousseau in his wild retreat [Môtiers-Travers]. . . . Johnson said sarcastically: "It seems, Sir, you have kept very good company abroad. . . . My dear Sir, you don't call Rousseau bad company. Do you really think *him* a bad man?" JOHNSON: "Sir, if you are talking jestingly of this, I don't talk with you. If you mean to be serious, I think him one of the worst of men; a rascal who ought to be hunted out of society, as he has been. Three or four nations have expelled him, and it is a shame that he is protected in this country. . . . Rousseau, Sir, is a very bad man. I would sooner sign a sentence for his transportation, than that of any felon who has gone from the Old Bailey these many years. Yes, I should like to have him work in the plantations." BOSWELL: "Sir, do you think him as bad a man as Voltaire?" JOHNSON: "Why, Sir, it is difficult to settle the proportion of iniquity between them."

Rousseau devait, en outre, pâtir de l'antipathie générale de Johnson à l'endroit de tout auteur français. Il s'irritait de ce que les Anglais, au lieu de se nourrir de leurs écrivains, eux qui avaient Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, continuaient à faire les snobs et à regarder outre-Manche pour décerner des palmes à des poètes et à des prosateurs. Il manquait rarement l'occasion de dénigrer les écrivains français, et se plaisait à exercer sa satire à leur dépens. Quand on lui parlait avec admiration de l'incroyable labeur que représentait son *Dictionnaire*, ajoutant que l'Académie Française, avec ses quarante membres avait mis quarante ans à préparer un dictionnaire, il répondait: "Précisément, 40 fois 40 = 160; c'est la proportion exacte; un Anglais vaut 160 Français." Et dans la Préface du *Dictionnaire* on lit: "J'ai consacré à ce travail des années afin que nous n'ayons plus à affirmer notre primauté philologique aux nations du continent." Il y avait, sous ces boutades un ressentiment qui cachait une admiration envieuse. Johnson lisait constamment du français.²

¹ On trouvera des renseignements sur Rousseau en Angleterre au 18^e siècle dans les articles de R. B. Sewall, *PMLA*, LII, P. Q. XVII et XVIII, *MLN*, LVII; et de J. H. Warner, *PMLA*, XLVII, LII.

² Boileau était son maître au travers de Dryden et Pope; son poème

Or, si Johnson, en dirigeant ses traits de satire contre les écrivains français en général, trahissait justement une admiration, on pouvait s'attendre, en somme, à découvrir une prévention de même espèce lorsqu'il s'agirait de l'écrivain le plus violemment attaqué par lui, Rousseau. Pour nous qui jugeons à distance, il est difficile de ne pas voir les points de contact entre les deux hommes.

Et d'abord, nous pouvons passer sans guère nous y arrêter sur le trait qui fait si bien de Johnson un véritable frère siamois de Rousseau, à savoir cette combinaison de l'ours avec l'homme aux grandes délicatesses de cœur—tous deux adoptent consciemment le rôle d'Alceste dans la société du XVIII^e siècle, méprisant les Philinte indulgents jusqu'à l'hypocrisie. La seule différence serait que Rousseau était loin d'être aussi prompt à la répartie que son émule anglais, et que, pour cette raison sinon pour une autre, Rousseau n'aurait jamais été assez bourru pour répondre : "Madame, avant de me jeter au visage un tel déluge de compliments vous feriez bien de vous demander si vos compliments peuvent avoir quelque valeur." C'est dans la correspondance des deux hommes que, sur ce point, on peut trouver l'accord complet. La lettre de Johnson à Lord Chesterfield, lorsque celui-ci avait trop attendu pour offrir son haut patronage à l'auteur du *Dictionnaire*, et où des vérités si fortes sont exprimées en langage merveilleux, trouverait bien des parallèles dans des lettres de Rousseau, à la maréchale de Luxembourg, à Mme de la Tour Franqueville, à M. de Malesherbes même, ou encore au roi de Prusse :

J'ai dit beaucoup de mal de vous; j'en dirai peut-être encore. Cependant, chassé de France, de Genève, du canton de Berne, je viens chercher un asile dans vos États. Ma faute est peut-être de n'avoir pas commencé par là; cet éloge est de ceux dont vous êtes digne. Sire, je n'ai mérité de vous aucune grâce, je n'en demande pas; mais j'ai cru devoir déclarer à votre

sur Londres est une satire inspirée de la 3^{me} de Juvénal, mais aussi de la 1^{ère} de Boileau. Il paraît que quand il lisait l'*Encyclopédie* chez Mrs Thrale, on ne pouvait l'en arracher. Et quand on crut voir que son *Rasselas* était un curieux parallèle de *Candide*, il s'en montrait fier. On peut ici renvoyer au travail excellent de Robert Klenker, *Dr. Sam. Johnson's Verhältnis zur französischen Litteratur* (Strasbourg, 1907). On y trouve mentionnés des emprunts indiscutables à La Bruyère, lequel était comme un bréviaire de Johnson; celui-ci connaissait presque par cœur les *Ménagiana*. On peut être étonné de certains de ses jugements; s'il appelle "pretty baubles" les vieux romans précieux, il tombe en admiration d'autre part devant Voiture et Scarron.

majesté que j'étais en son pouvoir, et que j'y voulais être: elle peut disposer de moi comme il lui plaira.

Plus important à souligner—et au premier abord moins apparent—est l'accord des deux écrivains quand ils jaugent l'esprit général de leur époque, époque où les mérites de l'esprit pèsent si peu en face des contingences mondaines. Qu'est-ce que le poème vengeur de Johnson, *London*, qui se résume en ces vers:

This mournful truth is everywhere confessed:
Slow rises worth by poverty oppressed,

sinon le cri de guerre lancé, sous une autre forme, dans le *Premier Discours* de Rousseau, contre les effets funestes d'un monde poli écrasant la vertu et le vrai mérite? Et lorsque Johnson, arrivant à la dernière page de son émouvante *Vie de Richard Savage*, résume la carrière de cette misérable victime du snobisme et de la persécution, par ces mots: "Qui oserait dire que, placé dans les mêmes circonstances que Savage, il aurait mieux vécu?" il est difficile de ne pas penser au mot célèbre de Rousseau: "Que chacun découvre son cœur au pied de ton trône, Être éternel, avec la même sincérité, et puis qu'un seul te dise, s'il l'ose: Je fus meilleur que cet homme-là!"

Voilà pour l'homme. Voyons maintenant le philosophe—quand Johnson n'est pas le simple porte-parole d'une doctrine, mais laisse voir un Johnson sincère et humain. Évitions l'examen détaillé, toujours un peu fastidieux, en citant un passage qui résume d'une façon très concise la "Weltanschauung" de Johnson et en affirmant bien haut qu'il y a bien des passages parallèles soit dans le *Rambler*, soit dans le *Idler*; rien de "littéraire" dans ces pages. Elles sont une expression de la sagesse philosophique acquise par l'expérience plus que par la lecture ou l'étude proprement dite. Ceci est tiré du *Idler*, du 30 déc. 1758:

... If the extent of the human view could comprehend the whole frame of the universe, I believe it would be found invariably true, that Providence has given that in greatest plenty, which the condition of life makes of greatest use; and that nothing is penuriously imparted or placed far from the reach of man, of which a more liberal distribution, or more easy acquisition, would increase real and rational felicity.

Iron is common, and gold is rare. Iron contributes so much to supply the wants of nature, that its use constitutes much of the difference between savage and polished life. . . . Gold can never be hardened into saws or axes; it can neither furnish instruments of manufacture, utensils of agriculture, nor weapons of defence; its only quality is to shine, and the value of its lustre arises from its scarcity.

Throughout the whole circle, both of natural and moral life, necessities are as iron, and superfluities as gold. . . . Nature makes us poor only when we want necessities; but custom gives the name of poverty to the want of superfluities. . . .

Superfluity and difficulty begin together. To dress food for the stomach is easy, the art is to irritate the palate when the stomach is sufficed. A rude hand may build walls, form roofs, and lay floors, and provide all that warmth and security require; we only call the nicer artificers to carve the cornice, or to paint the ceilings. Such dress as may enable the body to endure the different seasons, the most unenlightened nations have been able to procure; but the work of science begins in the ambition of distinction, in variations of fashion, and emulation of elegance. . . .

[Quant à la vertu] No man needs to stay virtuous till the moralists have determined the essence of virtue. . . . Religion may regulate the life of him to whom the *Scotists* and the *Thomists* are alike unknown; and the assertors of fate and free will, however different in their talk, agree to act in the same manner. . . . It is not my intention to depreciate the politer arts or abstruser studies. . . . Let us gratefully acknowledge that goodness which grants us ease at a cheap rate.

Il y a là trois idées fondamentales communes à Rousseau et à Johnson: (1) L'innéité et l'excellence de la conscience morale. *Johnson*: "No man needs to stay virtuous till the moralists have determined the essence of virtue." *Rousseau*: "Le théâtre rend la vertu aimable. Il opère un grand prodige de faire ce que la nature et la raison font avant lui." (2) La religion de l'adoration de la Providence. *Johnson*: "Let us gratefully acknowledge that goodness which grants us ease at a cheap rate." *Rousseau*: "Je médite sur l'ordre de l'univers pour adorer le sage auteur qui s'y fait sentir. . . . Je m'attends de ses bienfaits. Je le bénis de ses dons."

Un mot au sujet de la 3^{me}. L'homme a fait fausse route en abandonnant la nature comme guide; mais aurait-il pu ne pas faire fausse route en adoptant les progrès de la civilisation matérielle? La réponse de Rousseau et celle de Johnson sont les mêmes encore: oui, certes, car si l'homme a fait mauvais usage des connaissances acquises au cours des siècles, il pouvait en faire un bon. *Johnson*: "It is not my intention to depreciate the politer arts or abstruser studies." *Rousseau*: "Ce n'est point la science que je maltraite, c'est la vertu que je défends." (*Premier Discours*); et dans la polémique qui suit: "La science est très bonne en soi, cela est évident et il faudrait avoir renoncé au bon sens pour dire le contraire. L'auteur de toutes les bonnes choses est la source de la vérité; tout connaître est un de ses attributs; c'est

donc participer en quelque sorte à la suprême intelligence que d'acquérir des connaissances et d'étendre ses lumières." (*Réponse au Roi de Pologne*). "La science prise d'une manière abstraite mérite toute notre admiration; la folle science des hommes n'est digne que de risée et de mépris." (*Préface à Narcisse*).

Mais, dira-t-on, Johnson ne s'est pas fait faute de prodiguer l'anathème au sauvagisme de Rousseau. A quoi il faut répondre que Johnson ayant peu lu Rousseau—ou peu attentivement—lui a prêté gratuitement l'idée qu'il était un sauvagiste. Il n'est pas possible de reprendre ici un sujet de discussion abondamment traité par les étudiants de Rousseau depuis un certain nombre d'années.³

Un point plus facile à élucider brièvement est celui de l'attitude nette, convaincue et parallèle des deux écrivains en face du profond conflit qui sévissait au XVIII^e siècle entre les déistes anglais et les Encyclopédistes français, d'une part, et les défenseurs du témoignage de la conscience religieuse, d'autre part. Il suffit de rappeler deux passages de chacun de nos auteurs, passages également célèbres:

JOHNSON:—Hume, and other sceptical innovators, are vain men, and will gratify themselves at any expense. Truth will not afford sufficient food to their vanity; so they have betaken themselves to error. Truth, Sir, is a cow which will yield such people no more milk, and so they are gone to milk the bull. If I could have allowed myself to gratify my vanity at the expense of truth, what fame might I have acquired? Every thing which Hume has advanced against Christianity had passed through my mind long before he wrote. Always remember this, that after a system is well settled upon positive evidence, a few partial objections ought not to shake it. The human mind is so limited that it cannot take in all parts of a subject, so that there may be objections raised against any thing" (Boswell).

ROUSSEAU:—Je consultai les philosophes, je feuilletai leurs livres, j'examinai leurs diverses opinions; je les trouvai tous fiers, affirmatifs, dog-

³ Edme Champion, *J.-J. R. et la Révolution française* (A. Colin, 1910); Fr. Viel, *Revue pédagogique*, Déc. 1912, "La notion de l'homme naturel chez R."; A. Schinz, *Rev. du XVIII^e siècle*, Déc. 1913, "La notion de l'homme naturel chez R.," et *Pensées de R.*, 1920, pp. 177-89 (où il est démontré que le primitivisme est, d'ailleurs, en contradiction avec l'idée fondamentale du *Second Discours* même). Et récemment A. O. Lovejoy, *Modern Philology*, 1933, pp. 165-86, "The Supposed Primitivism of J.-J. R.," Henry S. V. Ogden, *Am. Pol. Science Review*, August, 1938, pp. 634-36, "The Antithesis of Nature and Art. R.'s Rejection of the Theory of Natural Rights."

matiques, même dans leur scepticisme prétendu, n'ignorant rien, ne prouvant rien, se moquant les uns des autres. . . . Quand les philosophes seraient en état de découvrir la vérité, qui d'entre eux prendrait intérêt à elle? Chacun sait bien que son système n'est pas mieux fondé que les autres; mais il le soutient parce qu'il est à lui. Il n'y en a pas un seul qui, venant à connaître le vrai et le faux, ne préférât le mensonge qu'il a trouvé à la vérité découverte par un autre. Où est le philosophe qui, pour sa gloire, ne tromperait pas volontiers le genre humain? Où est celui qui, dans le secret de son cœur, se propose un autre objet que de se distinguer? Pourvu qu'il s'élève au-dessus du vulgaire, pourvu qu'il efface l'éclat de ses concurrents, que demande-t-il de plus? L'essentiel est de penser autrement que les autres. Chez les croyants il est athée, chez les athées il serait croyant" (*Profession de foi*).

Nous voudrions toucher un dernier point. L'auteur du *Contrat social*—surnommé le père de la Révolution—peut-il avoir quoi que ce soit de commun avec le fanatique tory que Johnson a toujours voulu être?—Parfaitement. D'abord souvenons-nous que ce fanatique tory était un grand ami des humbles, et que pour avoir (comme Rousseau d'ailleurs) su goûter les raffinements de la société, il était un protecteur des déshérités: témoin les diverses épaves humaines qu'il avait recueillies chez lui et qu'il appelait son sérail; témoin ses égards touchants pour son valet noir Barber, qu'il servait autant qu'il en était servi; témoin surtout ses opinions très décidées sur l'immoralité de l'esclavage.⁴ Mais il croyait à l'autorité, ou nécessité d'autorité, en matière politique. Or, ce sont exactement les vues de Rousseau dont le *Contrat social* pivote tout entier sur les mots: "L'aliénation totale de chaque associé avec tous ses droits à toute la communauté" (I, VI). Peut-on être plus toryste? Que le "prince" de la communauté soit empereur, roi, duc ou président de république—c'est question de mots. Émile Faguet caractérisait le *Contrat* comme le pire traité de despotisme qui eût jamais été formulé—interprétation qui n'a cessé de gagner du terrain depuis le grand ouvrage de Vaughan. Et se souvient-on du chapitre sur "La Religion civile" (IV, VIII)? Chez Rousseau comme chez Johnson, la croyance religieuse constitue une partie intégrante du système politique. Leur façon d'aborder le problème religieux est d'essence toute pragmatique: la croyance religieuse constitue pour tous les deux la seule garantie absolue pour l'observation des clauses du contrat et des lois de la morale personnelle, d'où il suit qu'une société politique ne devrait pas permettre à un

⁴ Klenker déclare que, selon lui, Johnson ne fut jamais un "überzeugter Tory," p. 154.

athée d'y demeurer. Si Johnson n'a pas dit comme Rousseau qu'un athée s'ingérant dans la société et prétendant accepter la clause religieuse devait être puni de mort, il en a plus souvent que Rousseau exprimé l'idée.

Pour terminer, il sera piquant de mettre en regard du passage féroce—que nous avons cité tout au début—de Johnson à l'adresse de Rousseau, quelques mots de celui-ci se rapportant à celui-là. On y voit que le philosophe de Genève fut, lui, assez perspicace pour deviner très finement son frère d'Outre-Mer. C'est Boswell encore qui nous l'apprend. Lors de la visite qu'il fit à Rousseau à Môtiers-Travers, il avait parlé de son admiration pour Johnson, comme il devait parler à Johnson plus tard de son admiration pour Rousseau. Rousseau avait dit, après avoir bien écouté: "J'aimerais cet homme-là. Je l'estimerais. Si je pouvais l'ébranler dans ses principes, je ne le ferais pas. Je voudrais le voir, mais de loin, de peur qu'il ne me rossât. . . . Je lui rapportai (continue Boswell) le bon mot du Docteur sur les innovateurs: La vérité est une vache qui n'a aujourd'hui plus de lait à donner, et alors ils vont traire le taureau. . . . Alors, reprit Rousseau toujours souriant, mais avec quelque mélancolie cette fois: il me détesterait; il dirait: Voici un corrupteur d'hommes qui vient ici traire le taureau."

Philadelphia, Pa.

ALBERT SCHINZ

"PER L'ALTRE" *CONVIVIO*, III, xiv, 15

"Per le quali tre virtudi si sale a filosofare a quelle Atene celestiali, dove gli Stoici e Peripatetici e Epicurii, per la l[uc]e de la veritade etterna, in uno volere concordevolmente concorrono."¹

A note in this best edition of the *Convivio* explains that the reconstruction "la l[uc]e" has been adopted from the *Testo Critico della Società Dantesca Italiana* of 1921. It says: "I mss. danno 'per laltre,' dove a laltre nelle precedenti edizioni s'era sostituito l'arte." Presumably all the manuscripts give "per laltre": the one that is recognized as the best—the Barberiniano Latino 4086—gives it quite clearly.² Apparently, too, all the printed editions

¹ *Il Convivio*, ed. Busnelli and Vandelli, Vol. I, Firenze, 1934, pp. 430-431.

² *Il Convivio* di Dante Alighieri, riprodotto in fototipia dal codice Barb. Lat. 4086. Ed. Schneider. Bibl. Apostol. Vaticana, 1932.

before the *Testo Critico* have *l'arte*: those I have been able to see (Biscioni, Fraticelli, Giuliani, Moore, Flamini, Passerini, Della Torre) reproduce it without comment.

The same note goes on to suggest a third substitute for the *laltre* of the manuscripts, "*l'albore*," which seems better than the other two. It has a sense more suitable to the context and is palaeographically more plausible, for whereas it is not easy to see why a copyist who had before him a simple expression like *l'arte de la verità*,³ or a commonplace one like *la luce de la verità*, should be tempted to write *laltre de la verità*, he might be puzzled by the less simple *l'albore de la verità*, and *l'albore* has the final *re* of *laltre*.

However I do not intend to discuss the respective merits of the three emendations, for my contention is that the reading given by the manuscripts, *per laltre*, makes better sense than any of them, and should have been retained.

Removing the commas after *Epicurii* and *etterna*, and placing one after *laltre*, the passage reads as follows:

Per le quali tre virtù si sale a filosofare a quelle Atene celestiali, dove gli Stoici e Peripatetici e Epicurii per laltre, de la veritate eterna in uno volere concordevolmente concorrono.

The meaning, which is thus made clear, would be in modern language:

Per mezzo delle quali tre virtù si sale a filosofare a quell'Atene celeste verso cui gli Stoici, i Peripatetici e gli Epicurei, per mezzo delle altre (le altre virtù), si muovono d'accordo in un solo desiderio della verità eterna.

This fourteenth chapter of *Convivio* III begins by reminding us that "sapienza" is the "subietto materiale" of philosophy, and "amore" is its "forma," and the compound is "l'uso della speculazione." Speaking now particularly of the form of philosophy, "amore," it is said that, just as the rays of the sun make bright the object upon which they fall, to the extent to which the object is capable of receiving the light, so the divine power descends upon the love of wisdom, transforming it to its own likeness to the extent of its capability of being thus transformed. Now the love of wisdom is capable of being made similar to divine love because wisdom is eternal, and the objects of God's love are, properly speaking, the eternal things. This means that the noble soul, free in the use of reason, is made to perceive, by the divine power

³ Whoever first introduced *l'arte* may have had in mind "chi pesca per lo vero e non ha l'arte" of *Par.* xiii, 123.

descending upon it, that the wisdom it already loves is concerned with divine as well as human things; and since previous study has shown that many phenomena that were at first astounding are nevertheless rationally comprehensible, the noble soul is enabled to believe that the miracles of divine revelation may be comprehensible by a loftier intelligence than its own. In this way Christian faith may arise from rational philosophy, and hope that is based on faith, and active charity.

By means of these three theological virtues, the lover of wisdom, the philosopher, becomes a theologian; his philosophy becomes theology, the science which "perfettamente ne fa il vero vedere nel quale si cheta l'anima nostra":⁴ he rises to philosophize in the celestial Athens.⁵

The same three virtues, Faith, Hope and Charity, made known to us by the Holy Ghost in the scriptural revelation, are the necessary means for the attainment of celestial beatitude in Paradise, whereas the terrestrial beatitude on Earth can be attained by means of the moral virtues in the active life, perfected by the intellectual virtues in the contemplative life,⁶ which virtues are demonstrated by the philosophers:

Ad has quidem beatitudines, velut ad diversas conclusiones, per diversa media venire oportet. Nam ad primam per philosophica documenta venimus, dummodo illa sequamur secundum virtutes morales et intellectuales operando; ad secundam vero per documenta spiritualia que humanam rationem transcendunt, dummodo illa sequamur secundum virtutes theologicas operando, fidem scilicet, spem et caritatem. Has igitur conclusiones et media, licet ostensa sint nobis hec ab humana ratione que per philosophos tota nobis innotuit, hec a Spiritu Sancto qui per prophetas et agiographos, qui per coeternum sibi Dei filium Iesum Christum et per eius discipulos supernaturalem veritatem ac nobis necessariam revelavit, humana cupiditas postergaret nisi homines. . . .⁷

⁴ *Conv.*, II, xiv, 20.

⁵ For reasons too many to explain here, I am inclined to think that "Atene celestiali" means not Paradise but the realm of theological speculation. This view is in agreement with the commentary in chapter xiii on the lines beginning "Suo esser tanto a Quei che lel dà piace" and that in chapter xv on "Cose appariscon ne lo suo aspetto—che mostran de'piacer di Paradiso" (see the excellent notes of Busnelli) and not at all in disagreement with *Mon.*, III, xvi, 7-10, where, with a different purpose in mind, Dante says that the three theological virtues lead to "beatitudinem vite eterne, . . . que per paradisum celestem intelligi datur."

⁶ "Veramente è da sapere che noi potemo avere in questa vita due felicità, secondo due diversi cammini, buone ed ottimo, che a ciò ne

Beatitudo consists in the vision of the truth, the "veritade eterna" of our passage, the common end of both philosophy and theology:—" . . fine de la Filosofia è quella eccellentissima dilezione . . . cioè vera felicitade che per contemplazione de la veritade s'acquista." ⁸ "E dei saper che tutti hanno diletto,—quanto la sua veduta si profonda—nel vero in che si queta ogni intelletto." ⁹ ". . . vera illa beatitudo in sentiendo veritatis principium consistit; . . ." ¹⁰

As we are told in *Convivio*, IV, VI, the three schools of Pagan philosophy, "the Stoics and Peripatetics and Epicureans," were at one in seeking the true end of man: "quello dove dirittamente ogni umano appetito si riposasse." ¹¹ The fruit of their labours matured with the conclusion of Aristotle that "Felicitade è operazione secondo virtute in vita perfetta." ¹²

In *Convivio* IV, XXII the same three Pagan schools are said to be represented allegorically by the three Marys going to the sepulchre expecting to find the Saviour there. The sepulchre represents the present world, the Saviour represents perfect happiness, "beatitudine." The three philosophical sects are seeking human happiness in this world by means of the moral virtues of the active life. They are directed by the angel in the tomb, who represents the nobility of the human soul, to seek the Saviour, that is happiness, in Galilee, that is "ne la speculazione," by means of the intellectual virtues of the contemplative life. Not that they will find it even there, but they will then be travelling in the right direction and will attain the degree of happiness of which they are capable. "E così appare che nostra beatitudine (questa felicitade di cui si parla) prima trovare potemo quasi imperfetta ne la vita attiva, cioè ne le operazioni de le morali virtudi, e poi perfetta quasi ne le operazioni de le intellettuali." ¹³

The Stoics, Peripatetics and Epicureans can never reach the

menano: l'una è la vita attiva, e l'altra è la contemplativa; la quale, avvegna che per l'attiva si pervegna, come detto è, a buona felicitade, ne mena ad ottima felicitade e beatitudine, secondo che pruova lo Filosofo nel decimo de l'Etica." *Conv.*, IV, xvii, 9.

⁷ *Mon.*, III, xvi, 8-9.

⁸ *Conv.*, III, xi, 14.

⁹ *Par.*, xxxviii, 106-108.

¹⁰ *Epist.*, xiii, 89.

¹¹ *Conv.*, IV, vi, 8.

¹² *Conv.*, IV, xvii, 8.

¹³ *Conv.*, IV, xxii, 18.

"Atene celestiali" (no matter whether this expression means Paradise or the realm of Christian theology) to which one rises by means of the three theological virtues, because these philosophers are deprived of the Revelation of the Holy Scriptures which acquaint us with those three virtues; but they move as far as they can toward the perfect vision of the truth by means of the others, that is the moral and intellectual virtues.

The word "l'altre," which has been rejected by all the editors of the *Convivio*, is the word one would expect to be used to designate the moral and intellectual virtues, after the theological virtues have been mentioned: "Per le quali tre virtudi . . . per l'altre. . . ." It is the word used in a similar context by Virgil, speaking of the Limbus where he dwells with Aristotle and the other pagan philosophers:

Quivi sto io con quei che le tre sante
virtù non si vestiro, e sanza vizio
conobber l'altre e seguir tutte quante¹⁴

It is not easy to see what reasonable objection could be made to the reading as it is in the manuscripts. The syntactical inversion *de la veritade eterna in uno volere* makes no difficulty, since such inversions are frequent in Dante.¹⁵ Nor does, I think, the somewhat unusual use of *volere* as a substantive-infinitive with *di* and a substantive object in *uno volere de la veritade*.¹⁶ It may be said that, since all of the thirty-nine manuscripts are derived from a common source which was not an autograph, their unanimity does not guarantee the correctness of the reading. Nevertheless, even in the case of the *Convivio*, a reading given by all the manuscripts, which makes good sense, would seem to be preferable to others without manuscript support, and less suitable to the context.¹⁷

The University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ont.

J. E. SHAW

¹⁴ *Purg.*, vii, 34-36.

¹⁵ E. g. ". . . ne la quale de la divina luce assai mi si mostrava, . . ." *Conv.*, III, ii, 9. ". . . la verace de li uomini nobilitade, . . ." *Conv.*, IV, i, 11. ". . . la paura del disnore ricevere per la colpa; . . ." *Conv.*, IV, xix, 10.

¹⁶ Cf. "Tanto voler sopra voler mi venne—de l'esser su, . . ." *Purg.*, xxvii, 121-122.

¹⁷ If the editors of 1934 had kept the word "l'altre," they would not have needed to explain toward the end of note 1, p. 431: "Così sarà da interpretare questo passo, che, a prima giunta, sembra dire che le tre sette filosofiche avessero fede, speranza e carità; . . ."

MACHIAVELLI AND THE SPIRIT OF COMEDY

Whatever the exact date of composition of the *Mandragola* may have been, it was certainly written before one would expect much attention to be given to Aristotle or to any derivative theory of the Unities. Yet one readily notices the strict observance which the play seems to make of them. The most rabid Aristotelian critic of the second half of the century could not have found fault with its unity of time. The comedy is even explicit (with a smile) in its respect for uninterrupted action on a twenty-four hour basis. In closing Act IV, Friar Timoteo¹ says of that scene which decency would not allow on the stage and which took place in the late night and early morning:

E voi spettatori, non ci appuntate: perché in questa notte non ci dormirà persona, sì che gli Atti non sono interrotti dal tempo.

This is perhaps little more surprising than the observance that the play makes of the unity of place—which, again, is strict, and being the usual *piazza* scene throughout, quite the arrangement acceptable to any critic of the Counter-Reformation period.

Unity of action must likewise be granted the play—a unity, indeed, which goes deeper than what was to be demanded, later on, of comedy. More real unity of plot is to be found in the *Mandragola*, I believe, than in either Plautus or Terence. Its action is single, simple and straightforward in its development. The plot proceeds from a total combination of created interests to which the vehemence of Callimaco's love and the astuteness of Ligurio (in a kind of valet rôle of later comedy) are as the precipitating agent. In fact, the *Mandragola*, in the unilinear quality of its action, is outstanding among contemporary plays. The simplest of Ariosto's comedies seems complex in comparison, as does Bibbiena's; and Aretino's beside it seem a maze of actions and fragments of actions.

Moreover, in spite of a long tradition in the criticism of the *Mandragola*, praising it as a "comedy of character," the play clearly follows another famous "rule":

¹ In discussing the play with me, Prof. Leo Spitzer noted that throughout it is the Friar who most observes the passing of time, when, being a Friar, he should be the one most unconcerned with just that; also that he is emphatically shown to be always with women—two observations that seem to have an importance which cannot here be explored.

The Plot then is the first principle . . . Character holds the second place.*

Throughout this "comedy of character" Machiavelli has given first place to first things: to action. Nor is this surprising when one remembers the double parentage of this *commedia erudita*: a kind of comedy which, however erudite its memory of Latin comic structure may have been, never forgot that its other parent was Boccaccio and his offspring *novellistica*. So, even if this paternity were not a familiar historical fact, an attentive reader of the play, knowing Boccaccio, could not fail to sense its novella inheritance. We have no particular novella source for the plot of the *Mandragola*. Yet the outline of its action is so clearly a pattern created mainly by Boccaccio that one feels the order of its composition must have been, first *novella*, then *commedia*. Narrative structure is quite naturally its first principle.

On the other hand it is easy, aesthetically and historically, to understand the terms of Goldoni's remembered enthusiasm for Machiavelli's comedy:

Ce n'étoit pas le style libre ni l'intrigue scandaleuse de la pièce qui me la faisoient trouver bonne . . . mais c'étoit la première pièce de caractère qui m'étoit tombée sous les yeux et j'en étois enchanté.³

With Goldoni, of course, *pièce de caractère* does not mean that the "psychology" of characters in the play directs the construction of its plot. This would be to attribute to the eighteenth-century playwright that excess of our modern psychological critic whose damage Prof. E. E. Stoll has been at such pains to correct in Shakespearean criticism—and which has not been absent from the criticism of the *Mandragola*. Goldoni meant what any understanding reader of the play should mean today: that plot is a first principle, but that upon the plot (in the sense of argument or thread of action) is built a display of character in various *personae* which makes the play something more than the representation of a narration—that its dramatic dimension, in short, exceeds narration in the direction of "character." This, too, was perfectly *en règle* for the Aristotelian critic. Here again he could only praise the comedy.

As a matter of fact, the comedy received little attention from the critics of the second half of the century. It is interesting, however, to speculate a bit further and to wonder what such criticism would

* *Aristotle's Poetics*, vi (Butcher translation).

³ *Mémoires* (Florence, 1907, vol. I, p. 67).

have said of *one* character, at least, in the play, a character in whom plot does not seem to be recognized as a first principle. This is a woman in the third scene of the third act, a completely unattached figure in the play, known simply as *una donna*, in whom we shall here be chiefly interested.

It should be said at once that neither classical nor neo-classical dramatic criticism made any provision for such a character as this. The only incidental or unattached character for which there seems to have been any attempt at justification was what Corneille⁴ (and critics of antiquity) called the *personnage protatique*. But such a personage had a perfectly good *raison d'être* in service to *plot*, and this was all that was needed to justify him in neo-classical criticism. Thus, if Siro in the opening scene of the *Mandragola* had not appeared again in the play, he would have made a very good example of the *protatique*.

But as we shall see, the unattached character of Act III, sc. 3, cannot be reckoned with in terms of plot. She is not sub-narrative. She is, in fact, opposed to narration and outside of it. For this reason, chiefly, she interests us. She is the definition of a quality in the play, a quality by virtue of which the play is great, a quality which we might call its "local texture."⁵

⁴I have Professor Lancaster to thank for pointing this out to me. Corneille's remarks will be found in the *Discours du poème dramatique, Œuvres* (Grands Écrivains), t. I, p. 46.

⁵This is to borrow a term and a view from Mr. John Crowe Ransom's brilliant essay "Criticism as Pure Speculation" in the recent volume of essays by several entitled *The Intent of the Critic* (Princeton, 1941, pp. 91 ff.). Mr. Ransom is there concerned with poetic discourse while my present concern is with the structure of a particular play. With all apologies in advance to Mr. Ransom for any violations of his theory in the present appropriation of it, it does seem that his terminology of *logical structure* and *local texture* is capable of a wide application in critical discourse and that it can serve to give a name to things which older criticism fails to distinguish or account for. The present essay draws mainly from those parts of Mr. Ransom's essay where he speaks of *local texture* as "additions to the argument both energetic and irrelevant" which "give, in spite of the argument, which would seem to be perfectly self-sufficient, a sense of the real density and contingency of the world in which arguments and plans have to be pursued." "This character spreads out in planes at right angles to the course of the argument and in effect gives to the discourse another dimension not present in perfectly logical prose." As for this view directed specifically at dramatic discourse, Professor Stoll seems very close

The first form. (the "prose" form) of the *Mandragola*, that is, the *favola* which is its first principle, is clearly that of a *novella*. But what *local texture* does this structure bear? As a *pièce de caractère* it readily provides scenes which "spread out in planes at right angles to the course of the argument." That is, they are scenes which are witness to much more of an incidental display of "character" than is demanded by the *favola* in even its broadest sense. Old Nicia walks toward home with Siro, going for a *segno* from his young wife (Act II, sc. 3), but his talk is of other matters—matters which do not act *in plot* at all. Rather do they exhibit a concern for local texture as *opposed* to plot in the play. This is true of several scenes centered on Nicia and Callimaco or on the Friar alone. In fact, the local display of this other dimension seems to be what has earned praise (in varying terminology) for the *Mandragola*. Of course, the mere quantity of it would not make it a great comedy nor distinguish it from much contemporary production. But the quality of it does. Aretino has an abundance of the incidental, although it could be shown that what in his work is *incidental* is simply incidental *action* (forming little epicycles on the main action) rather than a display of condition or texture. Bibbiena's *Calandria* has considerable side-play away from the main line of the argument—but it is side-play into the farcical and into the *facezia*. One may recall many more comedies of the century including the *Candelaio*, only to return to a quickened appreciation of precisely the quality of this other dimension in the *Mandragola*—as something which is, by contrast, synthetic and three-dimensional.

Our woman of Act III, sc. 3, is almost completely contained within her dimension of local texture. In fact, she is such a pure case of it that she can stand, I think, as a kind of sign of the nature of the comic vision which gave life to the whole *Mandragola*.

In the scene in question, our eyes are focused on two figures standing on the steps of the Church: a friar and a woman. We see them both for the first time. The Friar is certainly that Confessor of Lucrezia whom we have been expecting because the argu-

to it when he speaks of "those imaginative and emotional comprehensions and interrelations, rather independent of the strictly narrative or narrowly dramatic, the probable or logical, the purposive or causal . . . transverse or radial instead of longitudinal." (*Dramatic texture in Shakespeare* in his volume *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, 1940, p. 36.)

ment has called for him. But the woman? Nothing has called for her. She is simply *una donna* to us and to the play. This is her first appearance and her last. For one brief scene she is before us, an entirely unattached figure, but one which completely dominates this scene. The naturalness of the idle chatter which flows from this woman's mouth as she talks with her confessor is astounding. It can only be appreciated in the Italian—or better, in the Florentine that it is. The Friar invites her to confession. Her reply, from her first words, makes the scene hers:

Non per oggi; io sono aspettata; e' mi basta essermi sfogata un poco così ritta ritta. Avete voi dette quelle messe della Nostra Donna? . . . Togliete ora questo florino, e direte dua mesi ogni lunedì la messa de' morti per l'anima del mio marito. E ancora che fussi uno omaccio, pure le carne tiro; io non posso fare non mi risenta quando io me ne ricordo. Ma credete voi che sia in purgatorio? . . . Io non so già cotesto. Voi sapete pure quello che mi faceva qualche volta. Oh, quanto me ne dolsi io con esso voi! Io me ne discostavo quanto io potevo; ma egli era sì importuno! Uh, Nostro Signore!

The other side of this dialogue to this point is so slight, the Friar has so little to say, that it is interesting to omit his remarks as above and contemplate the words of this woman as sufficient unto themselves. The Friar at this point barely has time to put in a few words when she is off again:

Credete voi che'l Turco passi questo anno in Italia? . . . Naffe! Dio ci aiuti con queste diavolerie! Io ho una gran paura di quello impalare. Ma io veggo qua in chiesa una donna che ha certa accia di mio; io vo' ire a trovarla. Fate col buon di!

And she is gone from the play for good.

This woman, we have suggested, now standing there with her flow of chatter and now gone from the play quickly and finally, is a kind of sign of the quality by which the whole play has greatness. She can stand as that sign and be herself at the same time because she has all the appearance of being unnecessary to the play. It might be claimed that she and the scene serve to display Friar Timoteo in a certain light. Nor can this be wholly denied. They provide material for the Friar's opening soliloquy of the following scene. They help place him by giving him ambience. Yet Timoteo receives much "character" exhibition in other scenes better planned to this purpose. Moreover, the accent in this scene is not on Timoteo. It is on the woman and very much on her.

Henry James, reporting an exciting conversation with Turgeneff, mentions "the intensity of suggestion that may reside in the stray figure, the unattached character . . . the trick of investing some conceived or encountered individual with the germinal property and authority."⁶ One is tempted to claim such "germinal property" for this figure of a woman in the play, so perfectly does she seem to be the revealing *macchia* for the whole; but, in this, not much speculative certainty is possible. One can, however, claim for her a kind of authority, as a sign. I mean that this wholly stray figure is a kind of pure manifestation of the quality of local texture which runs through the whole play, as well as a sample of the comic vision which rounds its little world. To this effect it seems significant that the figure and the scene have validity only within the play in the appointed order. It is no good to turn to this woman directly. She must be come upon within the play.

Such unattached figures are rare enough in the novella, but they can be found there. They are always a kind of measure of quality. When a story has them, it has body. Boccaccio has given us the husband of Monna Belcolore and a few others, but none so useless to plot, I believe, as is this woman. How useless she is to the *favola che Mandragola si chiama* the reader can test for himself by trying to translate the play back into its novella conception. This scene and this woman would have to be eliminated. Thus her absolute freedom from any contribution to narrative structure, her complete existence in a dimension at right angles to plot, is her claim to our interest. The play would be great without her. But it could offer from within itself no better sign of its greatness than what we find in her.

This woman has a meaning which can go beyond the play and touch the complete figure of the author. Viewed in the original Florentine garb of her language, she becomes more and more surprising as we study her. For, as a kind of comic vision, she stands in a pure light. I am surprised that Meredith missed her (and he noticed this very scene), but he seems to have been misled by watching the Friar and thinking the while, like so many other critics, of Tartuffe.

At the risk of seeming to overdo her importance, we must admit that there is indeed a quality to the comic vision which produces

⁶ Preface to *The Portrait of a Lady*.

her that can almost startle. For this woman is looked upon with no ridicule. Here is no farce, no caricature, no satire. There seems to be no laughter here. And it is the absolute *calm* of the gaze which takes her in and passes on to the progress of plot which can startle. Our wonder at such a quality of vision is increased when we remember the date. But regardless of the year, no one quite has looked upon humanity in just such a way. Dante might have come the nearest to it, but Dante would not accept this focus. Even in Hell our view of humanity eternally damned is framed (by the presence of Dante the onlooker) in hope and knowledge of a better fate and salvation—if not for those in Hell, then for others. But the gaze which brings this stray figure into the *Mandragola* is one which Machiavelli as artist shares with Machiavelli, author of the *Prince* and the *Discorsi*. It is an eye which can look steadily at humanity against no screen of superhuman Grace—an eye which plumbs the depths of a comic world to a point almost beyond laughter. Of this world, “dove gli uomini non sanno essere né in tutto buoni né in tutto tristi,” this woman seems an essence and a static sign.

If the spirit of comedy presiding over such a scene is almost *beyond* laughter, how is it that the *Mandragola* is so replete with laughter? If in this woman we glimpse for a moment “how men are” and if “how men are” is not “men as they are laughable,” how is this problem resolved in a play which so obviously means to provoke mirth?

Thus our stray figure has led us to what seems to be the basic critical problem of the play as comedy, and to the terms in which its “ontological locus” can perhaps be determined. The *Mandragola* would seem to be comic in the sense of laughable by the super-imposition of the ridiculous on a world which is not ridiculous. This could be followed through, for example, in the character of Messer Nicia. Nicia is not basically *marked* as a laughable character. In fact, without the rigid control of the play, he can become a pathetic one for us today. Nicia is a comic figure in the deeper sense in which the “*donna*” of Act III, sc. 3 is the sign in the play. Because of this, because he is basically beyond laughter, Nicia is made laughable through his language.⁷ By giving unusual

⁷ A passage in the prologue to the *Clizia* deserves attention for the support which it gives to this view of comic structure in Machiavelli. In

twists to his speech, by putting into his mouth idioms of such high Florentine colour that even Florentines would laugh at him—thus is he made a source of amusement. But this is a comic mask placed for the occasion upon an underlying view of human nature which, with our eyes upon our stray figure, will not escape us. Meredith should have found more in the *Mandragola* than he did. It had what he was looking for.

These are the terms, I feel, in which the proper critical measure of the play can be accomplished. When it is accomplished, our woman in pure local texture will not seem unimportant.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

SAINTE-BEUVE ON SCIENCE AND HUMAN NATURE: JOUFFROY, LE PLAY, PROUDHON

Théodore Jouffroy, author of the once famous *Comment les dogmes finissent* (1823), was held in affectionate esteem by Sainte-Beuve, yet the critical habits of the latter made him question what he clearly considered a *new* dogmatism of this eager reorganizer of human nature and human relations. Jouffroy is the first in date of several contemporaries scrutinized in terms of their affirmations about a scientific treatment of such problems—"scientific" connoting much more of metaphysics and of abstraction than would be acceptable today in French or in English. The critic, while following current verbal usage, had important reservations about science so conceived. The record is of interest for its bearing upon a significant trend of the last one hundred years and for what from a somewhat new angle it suggests about Sainte-Beuve.

that Prologue to a later comedy, M. is expressing more directly a theory of comedy, in no way original, but indicative of the determination to provoke laughter by making his characters ridiculous:

"Ma, volendo dilettere, è necessario muovere li spettatori a riso, il che non si può fare mantenendo il parlare grave e severo; perché le parole che fanno ridere sono, o sciocche, o iniuriose, o amorose. È necessario pertanto rappresentare persone sciocche, malediche o innamorate e perciò quelle commedie che sono piene di queste tre qualità di parole, sono piene di risa; quelle che ne mancano, non truovono chi con il ridere le accompagni."

Thus, in so far as Nicia wears a comic mask, he tends, through his language, to become the type of the *vecchio sciocco*.

The first three Jouffroy articles (1830-1831)¹ show the commentator taking the other's project for the analysis and control of humanity seriously enough to make serious objections. Fresh from his own studies as a medical student, less temperate of speech than he will become, he considers extravagant and grotesque Jouffroy's generalizations about what scientific and presumably experimental methods can do for the study and then the shaping of human destiny. Already Jouffroy is writing like a thorough determinist of the Taine school of thirty years later; already Sainte-Beuve is dubious. Partly as a physiologist perhaps and certainly in part as a moralist the young Sainte-Beuve, distrustful of abstractions, suggests already a programme that allies him both with predecessors of Descartes (compare the intuitions of Montaigne) and with the twentieth century (compare modern psychologists):

rester en plein dans le réel, dans l'unité substantielle de l'esprit et de la matière . . . vivre de la vie complète, profonde et intime, non seulement de la vie nette et claire de la conscience réfléchie et de l'acte voulu, mais de la vie multiple et convergente qui nous afflue de tous les points de notre être; que nous sentons parfois de la sensation la plus irrécusable, couler dans notre sang, frissonner dans notre moelle, frémir dans notre chair, se dresser dans nos cheveux, gémir en nos entrailles, sourdre et murmurer au sein des tissus. . . .²

The immediate alliance is no doubt, as Gustave Michaut says,³ with the Saint-Simoniens, but such passages contain in germ much of the future Sainte-Beuve soon to be free of this sect.⁴ He will become briefly but entirely explicit later about physiological developments,⁵ in subsequent writing about Jouffroy's "psychology." In these first articles he chiefly attacks habits of quick generalization. At the same time, with his own persistent humanist deductions, but also passing the centuries in review and clearly intend-

¹ *Premiers Lundis*, II, 1-49.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 35, 40.

³ *Sainte-Beuve avant les Lundis*, p. 239.

⁴ Sainte-Beuve later said (*Mes Poisons*, p. 196) that the opportunity to observe at first-hand the Saint-Simoniens taught him much about the behavior of religious reformers and made his touch more sure (more scientific) as a historian of Port-Royal.

⁵ On the other hand in one of these early articles (p. 17) Sainte-Beuve denies the validity of any chemical investigation of, for example, the lobes of the brain; he then had no notion, and for this he can hardly be reproached, that scientists would be talking later about the "chemical core of living matter" and the secretion of neurohumors.

ing to be historical, he writes with eloquent conviction about the triumph of man, "complete" as described above, over outside nature; Apollo has conquered the Python.⁶

In the next Jouffroy article (1833)⁷ further doubts are expressed about this "dogmatique par excellence"⁸ rashly presuming to be scientific and, what in this case brings out still more the humanist and the artist in Sainte-Beuve himself, there is expression of regret that Jouffroy distrusted and suppressed his own poetic urges.⁹ Indeed under such ruthlessly self-imposed logic Sainte-Beuve senses "l'ennui de l'âme."¹⁰ Concerning those moments where Jouffroy's imagination gave him a hint of the infinite creation of which he was so slight a fragment Sainte-Beuve writes with particular sympathy and once in a deeply personal tone: he too has had, for a brief instant, his Sinaitic vision.¹¹ The work of fiction that Jouffroy might have composed—and he did contemplate a novel—might well have been a psychological treasure-house; not for any systematization but for genuine insight into particular cases. Sainte-Beuve was writing this in December, 1833; his own novel, *Volupté*, on which he had been working intermittently since 1831, was published in July, 1834; again one may suspect an autobiographical note, less deliberate this time—and be reminded of Valéry analyzing himself in the person of Leonardo da Vinci.

Sainte-Beuve continued all his life, as passing references show, to be drawn to Jouffroy¹² and returned to the author formally in 1853 when he discussed Mignet's eulogy of the deceased member before the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*.¹³ He has always wished, he says again, that Jouffroy had not limited himself

⁶ P. 46.

⁷ *Portraits littéraires*, I, 296-324.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 319. Sainte-Beuve seems not to have been struck by the paradox that Jouffroy is particularly known as the author of *Comment les dogmes finissent*.

⁹ Sainte-Beuve mentions in a note two poems in *Joseph Delorme* which are about *Jouffroy* although the latter is not named.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 312. Cf. the Sainte-Beuve who writes later with admiration of the *Somnium Scipionis* and disparagingly of a near-sighted Chateaubriand (*Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, II, 401-403).

¹² Jouffroy's pioneer work in esthetics (cf. H. U. Forest, "Jouffroy et le problème de l'imitation dans les arts," *PMLA*, LVI, 1095-1102, December 1941) seems not to have interested him.

¹³ *Causeries du lundi*, VIII, 291 ff.

to speculations so abstract and sterile, wearing himself out in attempts to set up a merely conjectural science—meaning psychology, as it was understood in Sainte-Beuve's day. He had already looked dubiously upon this attitude in a by-remark of the 1833 article; psychology as practiced, he ventured to assert, except for certain contributions about details, satisfied mainly the personal convictions of the observer, and as a "science" had to be started anew by each person. And Sainte-Beuve had compared this psychologist to a fisherman fishing for his own reflexion in the water.¹⁴ Now, twenty years later, he raises the same question of principle; this kind of psychologist, not a true savant, "n'a qu'une science de reflets et de miroitements";¹⁵ he wishes Jouffroy and others had not drawn so absolute a line of demarcation between their psychology and physiology. And he adds a comment, literary, intuitive, which contains a hint of the twentieth century: psychologists would do well to consider La Fontaine and how for the study of man and the workings of the human mind he by no means excluded observation of animals and comparisons based upon natural history.

In 1869, the last year of his life, the critic makes a final, brief and again consistent allusion to Jouffroy. He publishes in a new edition of his *Portraits contemporains*¹⁶ a long and picturesque letter written him in 1833 by George Sand in which she agrees to make the acquaintance of Jouffroy but in which she sets down, with an acuteness inspired perhaps by some remark of Sainte-Beuve, her conjectures as to what Jouffroy is like. She suspects he is a man of small experience and innocently narrow-minded; she uses the occasion to compare him with Sainte-Beuve to the credit of the latter's tolerance and larger discernments. Sainte-Beuve was not a vain man, and it is not likely that he finally published this letter because of its compliment to him. He simply continues to be interested in moralists—and in moralizers. He says explicitly of this incident that in recommending Jouffroy as one new acquaintance who might help George Sand's mood of the moment he was not very subtle: "J'allais donner dans le doctrinaire." The lady brought this home to him, he tells us, with a kind of graceful docility.

¹⁴ *Portraits littéraires*, I, 305, note.

¹⁵ *Causeries du lundi*, VIII, 305, note.

¹⁶ I, 510-513.

Sainte-Beuve's numerous, often favorable, certainly not docile, judgments of the great doctrinaire Taine, notably in 1857 and 1864,¹⁷ involve issues related to those that arise with Jouffroy, but these would take one deep into literary history and literary criticism.¹⁸ For the moment I am looking principally at two or three men outside the field of *belles-lettres* who interested Sainte-Beuve, even induced him more or less unconsciously to introspection, because of their ambitions to make strictly scientific investigations of human nature and human society. The formal estimates of Jouffroy provide a sample of Sainte-Beuve's views about this enterprise over a considerable part of his life (1830-1853). A study of Le Play (1864), a book on Proudhon (1865), and also, in a case where the novelist attempts to become an uncompromising scientist,¹⁹ a letter to Zola (1868), offer parallel evidence for the final decade. The letter to Zola opens up other vistas.

Le Play is praised as a Polytechnicien, a metallurgist who brings his professional training to bear, intelligently, upon the problems of human society.²⁰ The article indicates no reversal of principles as compared with the earlier comments upon Jouffroy; in the engineer's mind of Le Play the critic finds no abuse of abstractions; Le Play is a kind of Bonald²¹ rejuvenated, progressive and scien-

¹⁷ *Causeries du lundi*, XIII, 249-284; *Nouveaux Lundis*, VIII, 66-137.

¹⁸ Taine wrote extensively about the theories and abstractions of Jouffroy in *Philosophes français du dix-neuvième siècle*, Paris, 1857, pp. 197-282. Taine as usual shows his liking for neat compartments ("Je n'entends plus du tout. Il n'y a là qu'une image poétique. Cela est littéraire, non scientifique," p. 234) and for formulas: Jouffroy wavers between Aristotelian analysis and the catechism; Jouffroy was "exclu de la vérité et voisin de la vérité." As a final proof of his own distrust of theories and fidelity to record Taine plays a game he calls "changement de siècle" and proves that Jouffroy would have been happier and greater had he been born in England in 1680, educated at Cambridge, etc.

¹⁹ Zola accepts the consequences of Taine's celebrated formula about vice and virtue, as Taine himself explicitly did not. Indeed the latter said of Zola's discipleship: "C'est un fils que je renie" (as quoted by Bourget, *Les Annales*, April 1, 1928).

²⁰ "Le Play, *La Réforme sociale en France déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens*," *Nouveaux Lundis*, IX, 161-201.

²¹ Sainte-Beuve wrote an article on Bonald in 1851 (*Causeries du lundi*, IV, 426-449). He is tolerant of the intolerance of Bonald as an interesting specimen of one mood of one epoch. Bonald is not directly related to the Jouffroy, Le Play, Proudhon sequence and, of course, in many ways was their opposite.

tific (evidently to Sainte-Beuve in the proper sense of this last word).

M. Le Play est d'une génération toute nouvelle, il est l'homme de la société moderne par excellence, nourri de sa vie, élevé dans son progrès, dans ses sciences et dans leurs applications, de la lignée des fils de Monge et de Berthollet; et, s'il a conçu la pensée d'une réforme, ce n'est qu'à la suite de l'expérience et en combinant les voies et moyens qu'il propose avec toutes les forces vives de la civilisation actuelle . . . en savant, en homme pratique, muni . . . de tous les matériaux particuliers qu'il a rassemblés.²²

The details of this passage show, in fine, that Le Play is credited with exactly the skill in observation and selection which Maurras will later admire in Sainte-Beuve himself as "organizing empiricism."²³ Sainte-Beuve has recognized a companion-spirit, indeed he is not utterly remote from the psychologist who contemplates himself—but he will never claim to be exclusively scientific.

Proudhon does. In one of the long and many passages from Proudhon which Sainte-Beuve quotes in his book about the confident socialist²⁴ the latter reproaches Jouffroy for having been only a weak and lukewarm practitioner of social science who failed to grasp the simple truth that the laws of arithmetic and algebra rule over the movements of societies as over the chemical combinations of atoms, that in the moral as in the mechanical world nothing happens *sine pondere et numero et mensura*.²⁵ Sainte-Beuve is naturally full of objections to the new social mechanist yet he admires, repeatedly, the grandiose ambitions of this earnest and sincere as well as arrogant pioneer. Even to be shipwrecked on these vast seas is heroic.²⁶ The centuries may prove Proudhon a prophet. But he is naïvely impatient. Sainte-Beuve protests in terms of a long French literary and cultural tradition of delicate appraisal.²⁷ He is not persuaded that everything is already arranged and for the best "in the best of possible

²² P. 189.

²³ *Trois Idées politiques*, 1898, Chapter III.

²⁴ *P.-J. Proudhon, sa vie et sa correspondance*, 1872; first published as four articles in *La Revue contemporaine*, October-December, 1865.

²⁵ P. 58.

²⁶ P. 109.

²⁷ "Le propre de la plus haute intelligence est dans un équilibre supérieur" (p. 37).

sciences."²⁸ He quotes Molière about "reasoning that banishes reason."²⁹ With Pascal he holds, although not in verbatim reference, that *l'esprit géométrique* is not enough. He points out explicitly that Proudhon might have found wise counsel in Pascal for wrestling with the contradictions in man—but Proudhon was too loftily dedicated to his "science toute nouvelle."³⁰ Such intemperance suggests to Sainte-Beuve on the other hand certain qualities of a much more recent French literary manner with which, we know, the critic was often not in sympathy. Something defective, or excessive rather, in the conformation of Proudhon's brain made him the victim of a sort of optical illusion; he saw things as bigger, nearer, more imminent than they were. "Victor Hugo a quelque chose de ce défaut ou de cet excès cérébral dans l'ordre visuel et pour ce qui est des couleurs: il voit trop gros, trop rouge et trop saillant."³¹ There is a comparable gigantism (although Sainte-Beuve does not trouble to make the comparison) in Proudhon, who likes to take all the bulls by the horns at once, who even, with a kind of Cyclopean merriment, delights in terrifying us; Sainte-Beuve suggests here that British reformers, of more human dimensions, have been wiser: Proudhon "joue de sa logique, de sa massue d'Hercule, et la promène sur les têtes comme quelqu'un qui n'a rien à ménager. . . . Et voilà une des mille raisons qui font qu'en France on n'a pas de Richard Cobden."³²

Such a passionately rectilinear science is to Sainte-Beuve not authentic science. Again he calls for more attention, on the part of

²⁸ P. 271. Cf. also a letter of Sainte-Beuve's maturity to Prosper Enfantin (9 jan. 1859) wherein likewise the critic suggests that he has reservations on this matter: "Aussi . . . ne vous ai-je jamais jugé, ni vous, cher Maître, ni Saint-Simon; juger, c'est appliquer un *criterium*, et je n'en ai pas pour la Science sociale" (*Amateur d'Autographes*, 15 avril, 1903, p. 63; also in *Livré d'or de Sainte-Beuve*, p. 241).

²⁹ P. 333.

³⁰ P. 223.

³¹ P. 342. There are of course any number of references in Sainte-Beuve to this characteristic of Hugo, from the critic's early letters directly to the poet (e.g. the letter on *Cromwell*, February 13, 1827, in *Correspondance générale*, I, 78-81) to the section on Hugo in *Mes Poisons* (pp. 36-56). * Cf. in *Mes Poisons* Sainte-Beuve's allusion to an entire "génération ampoulée," his own (p. 23). Note how far all this takes one beyond the indulgence in personalities and *rancune* with which Sainte-Beuve is almost invariably charged.

³² P. 168.

these analysts of human relations, to physiology, with its laws "multiple and mysterious."³³ The epithet "mysterious" is more suggestive of *belles-lettres* than of laboratories; even so Sainte-Beuve senses modern developments, and we have just seen him writing somewhat as a modern physiologist of the brain of the social crusader he wishes to understand. He is also seen to be sufficiently aware of the ways of competent professional scientists to issue a warning about laymen who dabble; when Proudhon for example ventures into astronomy he misses vital distinctions: "les profanes devraient parler le moins possible de ces choses, sur lesquelles ils ne font que balbutier."³⁴

A layman who was soon, after his own fashion, to grow very articulate about the extension to daily human living of scientific methods, who was well aware of Proudhon, and who insisted that Sainte-Beuve notice his own work, was Emile Zola. The letter Sainte-Beuve wrote him becomes a part of this survey. The situation is at first glance slightly bewildering because Zola is convinced that Proudhon "marche en pleine erreur"³⁵ when he tries to comprehend artists and this because of his failure to realize that art is a matter of individual temperament, whereas Sainte-Beuve in turn believes that Zola "fait fausse route" because Zola would have the artist turn scientifically impersonal. The solution as regards Zola may lie in the dates, in a rapid evolution after *Mes Haines* (1866), in which he included Proudhon, toward *Le Roman expérimental* (1880). Present concern is with Sainte-Beuve's letter to Zola of June 10, 1868 wherein, yielding to the novelist's urgings, he expresses an opinion of *Thérèse Raquin*.³⁶ Your book, he says,

³³ P. 130

³⁴ P. 200, note. There is one case where Sainte-Beuve deliberately urges close collaboration between artist and savant; in an article, of the same decade (1863), on Littré (*Nouveaux lundis*, V, 200-256), he imagines the admirable French dictionary that might result from a union of the discriminating culture of the Academy and the scientific competence, a little absolute, of a Littré.

³⁵ Zola, *Mes Haines*, 1866, article on "Proudhon et Courbet." My own art, says Zola, is outside of all rules and social necessities. Yet there would seem to be the germ of the other Zola in Proudhon when the latter says approvingly that "un philosophe expérimente sur des idées comme un physicien sur des corps" (quoted by Sainte-Beuve, *Proudhon*, p. 124).

³⁶ *Correspondance*, II, 314-317. Sainte-Beuve wrote no article on Zola and was clearly reluctant to send this letter.

is remarkable, and may mark an epoch in the evolution of the novel. But even so such a work "dépasse les limites . . . sort des conditions de l'art à quelque point de vue qu'on l'envisage; et, en réduisant l'art à n'être que la seule et simple vérité . . . me paraît hors de cette vérité." In Sainte-Beuve's opinion nothing in the novel justifies the epigraph (which he did not say and did not need to say was taken from Taine) to the effect that vice and virtue are products like vitriol and sugar. Zola is neither an authentic savant nor a true artist: "Je prétends qu'ici vous manquez à l'observation ou à la divination. C'est fait de tête et non d'après nature." Sainte-Beuve seems to find Zola making up "facts" in his head quite in the manner of Jouffroy and Proudhon.

No doubt the most vital issue here is that about Truth. Aiming so uncompromisingly at *la vérité simple*, says Sainte-Beuve, makes you miss it. This somehow recalls the Sainte-Beuve in the person of Joseph Delorme who insisted almost forty years earlier that "une vérité est toujours moins vraie exprimée que conçue."³⁷ The argument is not that one should abandon expression but that one must both seek it and distrust it. Zola, for Sainte-Beuve, is evidently oversanguine and impatient. At the same time the doubts of the critic, the artist, about "la seule et simple vérité" constitute a contrast (that is something of a shock) to the frequently quoted remark of Sainte-Beuve: "Si j'avais une devise, ce serait le *vrai*, le *vrai* seul.—Et que le beau et le bien s'en tirent ensuite comme ils pourront!"³⁸ Jean Bonnerot, of whom it is said that he knows more about Sainte-Beuve than did Sainte-Beuve himself, insists upon this remark when stressing the scientific character of the critic's work in an article relative to the *Musée de la littérature* of the Paris Exposition of 1937.³⁹ And in the Sainte-Beuve *Tableau* which Bonnerot prepared for this occasion he quoted another statement wherein Sainte-Beuve declared himself to be as fanatical a truth-seeker as the most extreme scientist: "J'irais au bout du

³⁷ "Pensées de Joseph Delorme," *Poésies*, I, 180. Cf. Baudelaire, Sainte-Beuve's disciple in some ways, on indispensable obscurity.

³⁸ Letter to Victor Duroy, 9 December 1865. *Correspondance*, II, 41.

³⁹ *Ebauche et premiers éléments d'un musée de littérature*, Paris, Denoël, 1938. "Sainte-Beuve," pp. 20-24. Taine would have been fascinated by this exhibit (cf. Taine, *Philosophie de l'art*, II, 1: "nos musées sont des muséums").

monde pour une minutie comme un géologue maniaque pour un caillou." May it not be, with all deference to Jean Bonnerot, that Sainte-Beuve's talk of a *devise* had in it a touch of *boutade* or counter-*boutade*? He was looking here at the "belle devise et surtout spécieuse" of Cousin: *le beau, le bien, le vrai*. He never cared for such systematization; moreover he was dubious about Cousin, not a really great man,⁴⁰ and he was dubious of *idées reçues* about the good and the beautiful or anything else. He immediately proceeds in this letter to attack the stultifying and devitalizing notion of examining current literature from the point of view of a tradition, a code.⁴¹ The protest, in favor of *le vrai seul* may be as much the reaction of the supple and imaginative man of letters against a certain formalism as that of the fact seeker. No doubt, as is commonly repeated, Sainte-Beuve's critical works "gave a scientific foundation to literary analysis"—but the artist persists.

The present record shows for one thing an artist holding out steadily for more of finesse, notably in reference to Jouffroy and Proudhon. Sainte-Beuve has a reputation, supported indeed by the most commonly cited of his own self-analyses, for being the least persistent of men, a sort of intellectual chameleon ("Je suis l'esprit le plus brisé et le plus rompu aux métamorphoses," etc.); it is often forgotten that in this same passage he insists that he

⁴⁰ Cf. "Pensées de Joseph Delorme," *Poésies*, I, 181, note: Cousin "joue . . . le génie" In the second of these "Pensées" Sainte-Beuve cites Cousin's quip: "Il y a toujours les trois quarts d'absurde dans tout ce que nous disons"—which is probably related to the first "Pensée," about attempts to express the truth one conceives, but which likewise provides opportunity for counter-boutades. Sainte-Beuve's four articles about Cousin have slight relation to the present science problem; he notes that Cousin's eclecticism was acceptable neither to the orthodox believers nor to the physiologists.

⁴¹ At the end of the *Proudhon* are published a few notes and fragments which the critic seems to have written at the same time and in the same year, 1865. He engages in speculation about the future of literature, and he sees no reason why literature should not move forward as science is expected to do. The persistent pioneer in him comes out in a glance towards the new world, which he considers crude perhaps but vigorous, and he indulges (p. 349) in a "coup d'oeil sur la littérature américaine . . . qui a . . . depuis Franklin jusqu'à Emerson son cachet original et qui peut l'avoir de plus en plus.—Dans toute cette littérature, comme on se passe de la littérature, des vieilles idées reçues!"

never abdicated will or judgment.⁴² The present record also shows this artist deeply interested in a scientific attitude towards human relations,⁴³ more comprehending of its potentialities than a psychologist like Joubert or a socialist like Proudhon, thoroughly sympathetic with the engineer's mind of a Le Play; the moralist in Sainte-Beuve while attached in tradition and in practice to Montaigne and others of a noble line had glimpses of a future alliance of the methods of a delicate art and an authentic science. This is the man who wanted in criticism at once more *charm* and more *reality*, "de la poésie à la fois et quelque physiologie."⁴⁴

Columbia University

HORATIO SMITH

ENG. *DISMAL* = O. F. **DISM-AL*

The generally accepted opinion about the etymology of this English word is that which is reflected in the *NED* and which is in essence identical with the commentary to lines 1206-07 of the *Book of the Duchess* (*I trowe hit was in the dismal, That was the ten woundes of Egipte*) given by Skeat in his edition of Chaucer:

Dismal. In this particular passage the phrase *in the dismal* means 'on an unlucky day,' with reference to an etymology which connected *dismal* with the Latin *dies malus*. Though we cannot derive *dismal* immediately from the Lat. *dies malus*, it is now known that there was an Anglo-French phrase *dis mal* (= Lat. *dies mali*, plural); whence the M. E. phrase *in the dismal*, 'in the evil days,' or (more loosely), 'on an

⁴² *Portraits littéraires*, I, 545 ("Pensées," xv).

⁴³ In a brief address to medical students in 1868 Sainte-Beuve stresses, as he naturally would to them, the physiological side: "la seule garantie de l'avenir, d'un avenir de progrès, de vigueur et d'honneur pour notre nation est dans l'étude,—et surtout dans l'étude des sciences naturelles, physiques, chimiques, et de la physiologie. C'est par là que bien des idées vagues ou fausses s'éclaircissent ou se rectifient. . . . Ce n'est pas seulement l'hygiène physique de l'humanité qui y gagnera, c'est son hygiène morale. . . . Etudiez, travaillez, messieurs, travaillez à guérir un jour nos malades de corps et d'esprit." (*Lettres à la princesse*, pp. 336, note).

A comprehensive study should be made of Sainte-Beuve and the physical sciences.

⁴⁴ *Portraits littéraires*, I, 546 ("Pensées," xix). Sainte-Beuve added in another version of this *Pensée* (*Mes Poisons*, p. 120): "La physiologie gagne avec les années."

evil day.' When the exact sense was lost, the suffix *-al* seemed to be adjectival, and the word *dismal* became at last an adjective. The A. F. form *dismal*, explained as *les mal jours* (evil days), was discovered by M. Paul Meyer in a Glasgow MS. (marked Q. 9 13, fol. 100, back), in a poem dated 1256; which settles the question. Dr. Chance notes that Chaucer probably took *dis-mal* to be derived from O. F. *dis mal*, i. e. 'ten evils'; see l. 1207.

We can now see the connexion with the next line. The whole sentence means. 'I think it must have been in the evil days (i. e. on an unlucky day), such as were the days of the ten plagues of Egypt'; and the allusion is clearly to the so-called *dies Ægyptiaci*, or unlucky days; and *woundes* is merely a rather too literal translation of Lat. *plaga*, which we generally translate by *plague*. In Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Naturale*, lib. xv. c. 83, we find.—'In quolibet mense sunt duo dies, qui dicuntur *Ægyptiaci*, quorum unus est a principio mensis, alter a fine.' He goes on to show how they are calculated, and says that, in January, the Egyptian days are the 1st, and the 7th from the end, i. e. the 25th; and he expressly refers the name *Ægyptiaci* to the plagues of Egypt, which (as some said) took place on Egyptian days; for it was asserted that there were minor plagues besides the ten. See also Brand's *Pop. Antiquities*, ed. Ellis, from which I extract the following. Barnabe Googe thus translates the remarks of Naogeorgus on this subject [of days].—

'But some of them Egyptian are, and full of jeopardée,
And some again, beside the rest, both good and luckie bee'

Brand (as above), ii. 45.

'The Christian faith is violated when, so like a pagan and apostate, any man doth observe those days which are called *Ægyptiaci*,' etc.—Melton's *Astrologaster*, p. 56; in Brand, ii. 47. 'If his Journey began unawares on the *dismal day*, he feares a mischiefe'; Bp. Hall, *Characters of Virtues and Vices*; in Brand, ii. 48. 'Alle that take hede to *dysmal dayes*, or use nyce observaunces in the newe moone,' etc; *Dialogue of Dives and Pauper* (1493); in Brand, i. 9. 'A *dismol day*'; *Tale of Beryn*, 650. Compare also the following —

'Her *disemale daies*, and her fatal houres';

Lydgate, *Storie of Thebes*, pt. iii. (ed. 1561, fol. 370).

In the *Pistil of Swete Susan* (Laing's *Anc. Pop. Poetry of Scotland*), l. 305, Daniel reproves one of the elders in these terms.—

'Thou hast i-be presedent, the people to steere,

Thou dotest now on thin olde tose, in the *dismale*.'

In *Langtoft's Chronicle*, l. 477 (in *Wright's Polit. Songs*, p. 303), John Balliol is attacked in some derisive verses, which conclude with:—'Rede him at ride in the *dismale*'; i. e. advise him to ride on an unlucky day. Cf. *The Academy*, Nov. 28, 1891, p. 482; etc.

The consequence of 'proposing' on an unlucky day was a refusal; see l. 1243.

The gist of Skeat's interpretation is, in turn, repeated in F. N. Robertson's edition. But Paul Meyer himself, in his original pub-

lication of the Anglo-French poet Raüf de Linham (1256), seems much less convinced of the etymology *dismal* = O.F. *dis mal*; without committing himself this editor comments merely: "Il [Raüf] donne ainsi l'explication du mot anglais *dismal*: '*Dismal* les appellent plusours, Ceo est à dire les mal jours'." And indeed, for us, no more than for Paul Meyer, should this *attempt* at an etymology by the thirteenth century poet, "settle the question." For the "Anglo-French *dis mal*" of which Skeat speaks is nowhere attested—and for several very good reasons: in the first place a Lat. *dies mali*¹ could give in Old French only **di mal* (or, in the oblique case of the plural, **dis maus*): no such hybrid combination as **dis mal*, with the noun in the oblique, the adjective in the nominative form, could exist. Secondly, the adjective *mal*, used with emotive force, generally precedes the noun (as is evidenced by the phrase in our own passage *mal jours*, and in Godefroy, s. v. *mal*, by the attestations of *maujour*²; cf. also in Godefroy *mal tems*, *male semaine* etc.). Finally, the substantive *di* is scarcely to be found in O. F. except in stereotyped phrases (*puissedi* = *puis cel di*, Alexius) or as an element of petrified compounds such as *lunsdi*, *midi*; the explanation *les maljours*, given by Rauf de Linham, suggests by it what must have been the normal way of expressing in O. F. the idea 'dies nefasti.' Moreover, as regards English usage, the expression 'dismal days' is attested only a little later than is the original phrase 'in the dismal'; the addition of the word 'day' to a word itself suggesting the idea 'day' is rather surprising. In the French sentence of R. de Linham *dismal les*

¹ *dies mali* is likewise unattested in Classical Latin as a stock-phrase, so far as I have been able to determine; we find, however, in Petronius a [*dies*] *incomodi* (as opposed to *dies boni*), and it is possible that this may represent a euphemism for a **dies mali* that was current. For late Latin, the ThLL (s. v. *dies* col. 1057) attests the singular *dies mala* (e.g. Vulg. Ps. 40, 2: *in die mala*), but I was able to find traces of the plural *dies mali* only as late as Ugutio (Du Cange s. v. *dies aegyptiacus*).

The only possible way of retaining the etymology *dies mali* would be to assume that the French word represents a vulgar adaptation from a (late) Latin phrase which would have become common: that is, O.F. *dismal* would be, not a compound of two French words, but could only come directly from the Latin *di(e)s mal(i) > dismal*.

² In fact, *les mal jours* should have been printed in P. Meyer's text as a compound: *les maljours*; cf. the examples in Godefroy, and also *maltems*, *malesemaine* etc.

appelent plusours, *dismal* could be an adjective referring to *jours* in which there is no place for a compound with *dies*.

The etymological explanation *dismal* = O. F. *dis mal* (Lat. *dies mali*) is further invalidated by the two lines of Chaucer cited above in which, according to Dr. Chance, he identifies *dismal* with the 'ten evils' (*dis mal* = *decem mala*). No one has adopted the etymology of Chaucer; why should we then adopt that of the other medieval poet? In fact we know today that to medieval writers etymology offered an opportunity, not only of punning and amplification (cf. A. Schiaffini, *Tradizione e poesia*, p. 96) but of developing the ample possibilities of symbolism latent in language: various phonetic associations could be used to clarify the *res* referred to by a particular word. Isidore in his collection of various etymologies started this 'poly-etymological' approach by putting side by side different traditional explanations with no attempt to decide between them. Compare:

(Origines V, 30-31) *Mane lux natura et plena, nec iam crepusculum. Et dictum mane a mano; manum enim antiqui bonum dicebant. Quid enim melius luce? Alii mane aestimant vocari a Mamibus, quorum conversatio a luna ad terram est. Alii putant ab aere, quia manus, id est rarus, est atque perspicuus.*

In St. Bernard of Clairvaux we find in full development that medieval conception of etymology "che . . . analizza i vocaboli al fine di dar sviluppo e decoro al discorso, di gettar luce sulla cosa e sul nome descritti, di cavar dal nome, con avveduta opportunità, applicazioni morali a beneficio degli uditori" (thus the name of the Virgin Mary is developed in St. Bernard's sermons according to the 'interpretio nominis' *Maris stella* and *Mater Virgo*). I may be allowed to quote here a series of etymologies³ used to this same moralistico-exegetic purpose by Gautier de Coincy (cf. E. Lommatzsch, "Gautier de Coincy als Satiriker" p. 119):

Beguin, ce dient, sont benigne, . . .
Beguin, ce dient, se derive
E vient a benignitate.
Ha! ha! larron, quel barat, é!

³ The series of word etymologies that purported to teach the reality of the *res* expressed by the word, is a parallel to the series of moral interpretations ('moralizations') given to 'things' by medieval commentators on animals, stones, ancient legends: in either case the *res* is approached from different angles.

Je i sai autre derivoison,
 A la milleur des deus voise on.
 Beguin certes ne sont pas doz,
 Ja sort ce qu'aient symples voz,
 Ainz sont poignant plus que fregon.
 Beguin se viennent de *begon*,
 Et de beguin viennent begarz,
 Et ce voit bien nés uns soz garz
 Que de begart vient *brais* et *boe*
 Qui tot conchie et tout emboe.

Thus it would not be in the least surprising to find in *one* medieval text the *two* etymologies of *dismal* above mentioned (= *dies mali* and *decem mala*), in the manner of St. Bernard and Gautier de Coincy: etymologies of this nature are applications of the etymological principle of the Middle Ages *nomina sunt consequentia rerum*; accordingly they must be considered as 'pseudo-etymologies' by us modern scholars, who do not look for the 'etymon' as a possible hint, one among many, to the *real* nature of things, but as *the* historically true word out of which the word in question has *in fact* developed. Moreover the 'poly-etymologies' of the medieval writers do not concord even with the naive feeling of the speaking community of their own time, which would accept only *one* explanation, provided the word is etymologically transparent.

The procedure of the ancients, who had not found the principle of derivation, to see compounds everywhere (thus Varro explained *vineta* by *vite multa*, *quaerere* = *quae res*, cf. H. Steinthal, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern*, p. 344) was continued by Isidore and the mediaeval scholars,⁴ who

⁴ . . . and also by the mediaeval preachers. E. Gilson, *Les idées et les lettres*, p. 129, commenting on what appears to our eye as puns in Menot: *mutuum dicitur quasi de meo tuum*; *civitas dicitur quasi civium unitas*; *mulier dicitur quasi mollis aer*, writes:

"Il s'agit . . . du plus sérieux des procédés de développement, dont Isidore de Séville fait généralement les frais, et qui se fonde sur cette conviction, que l'analyse de la structure des mots révèle, par les parties composantes du mot, les parties composantes de l'idée . . . Guillaume d'Auvergne est fort clair sur ce point: "Hoc autem genus loquendi (*scol.* derivatio et compositio) vocant grammatici ethimologiam, quando scilicet alicujus vocabuli virtus et ratio per suam compositionem declaratur, ut *magnanimus*, *magnus habens animum*; et *justus*, *juri stans*; et *humilis*, *humi labilis*; et *lapis*, *ledens pedem*; et *superbus* *super bonos* dominari cupiens, aut *superans* et *suppeditans bonos* quia etiam bonos preesse cupit. Sic *mansuetus*, *manu*

were thereby prevented from analyzing our word into radical + suffix: they divided it *dis-mal* instead of *dism-al*. The principle which was thus violated is one which I have enunciated several times (e. g. in my article on '*bigot*,' *ZRP* LXIV, 189, where it is shown that the right division of this word is not *bi-got* but *big-ot*) and which I have since found expressed, most felicitously, as early as the eighteenth century: cf. Turgot's article on *étymologie* in the *Encyclopédie* (*Oeuvres*, ed. Echelle I, 478 and 491):

Il est naturel de ne pas chercher d'abord loin de soi ce qu'on peut trouver sous la main. L'examen attentif du mot dont on cherche l'étymologie, et de tout ce qu'il emprunte, si j'ose ainsi parler, de l'analogie propre de sa langue, est donc le premier pas à faire. Si c'est un *dérivé*, il faut le ramener à sa *racine*, en le dépouillant de cet appareil de terminaisons, et d'inflexions grammaticales qui le déguisent. . . .

Thus the modern etymologists who have failed to subtract the current suffix *-al* from *dismal*, have acted in subservience to medieval prescientific practices. This would not be the first time that our scholars have gullibly identified their own endeavors with the rambling etymologies of the Middle Ages.

But what is the radical *dism-*? I assume that it is the O. F. *disme* (= Lat. *decima* [sc. *pars*]) 'tithe';⁵ the suffix *-al*, a learned

assuetus; et *dominus*, dans *minas*; et *superbia*, *superbiens*; et *mulier*, *mollis* *herum*, conformiter et apte componuntur."

Similarly the appellative *li margariz* (> *μαργαρις*), epithet of Isembard, is analyzed by Philippe Mousket as a compound: *mar-gariz* 'ill-saved.' It is perhaps the same sort of analysis which accounts for the number of Saracen names (i. e. names bestowed upon Saracens by Christians) such as *Margariz*, *Margance*, *Marsilie*, and many other similar appellatives with a *mal-* prefix (v. the index of the Bédier-Foulet edition of the *Roland*)—In the *Donat proençal* the word *gollarz* ('goliard') is analyzed 'ardens in gula' (= *goll-* + *art* = ardet); and in the *Carmina burana* we find the etymological pun *Roma manus rodit* (*Ro-ma* = *rodit manus*), cf. Crescim, *Románica fragmenta* (1932), p. 215 and 213 f. Rabalais' pseudo-etymological explanations of proper names are based on the assumption of compounds: *Beauce* = [je trouve] *beau ce*, Paris = [baigné] *par ris*, *Gargantua* = *que grand tu as* [le gosier]. Cf. Cervantes' *Rocmante* = *rocin* + *antes*. The technique of the *rime équivoquée* as found with the *rhétoriciens* is another outgrowth of the medieval etymological thinking in terms of compounds. And P. Claudel's punning equation *connaissance* = *co-naissance* is medieval in the assumption of a (historically impossible) compound.

⁵ Eng. *dime* in fact originally meant 'tithe'—a meaning which has now become obsolete. In M. E. there were also forms with *-s* (v. *NED*: *dyse*); as regards the fact that the *-s* has been preserved in *dismal*, while it has

variant of the popular *-el*, = Lat. *-alis* as found in O. F. (*di*) *festal* (cf. for the variant *-el*, *le caresmel* = *quadragesimalis* [*dies*]). A *dies decimales* > O. F. (*di*) *dism-al* (or a *decimale* [*tempus*]) would account for Eng. in the *dismal*, as well as for the later *dismal day(s)*.⁶

As concerns the connection of the idea of a 'tithe' with a calendar period,⁷ one may consult the note to a passage of the O. Prov. Sermons (*Ara es lo terminis que nos maiorment devem nostras carns amermer e devem las desmar*) which Chabaneau published in *Revue des langues romanes* XXII, 173:

Le passage suivant de saint Grégoire le Grand (Homélie XVI) expliquera l'emploi de ce terme: "Quia ergo per carnis desideria Decalogi mandata contemnimus, dignum est ut eandem carnem quaterdecies affigamus. Quam-

disappeared in *dime* (as it has likewise in *blame*, *aim* < *esmer* etc.: O. F. *-s-* is regularly maintained only before surds [*beast*, *host* etc.], cf. Miss Pope, *From Latin to Mod. French*, 377), I would explain this by reference to a learned form (cf. *baptism*, *schism*)—which supposition is consonant with the learned form of the suffix *-al*.

*The connection of *dismal* with *decima* has already been proposed by Skeat in the first edition of his etymological dictionary (he found the semantic link in the heavy taxes or 'tithes' imposed during the Middle Ages by lay suzerains on their vassals); later, however, he rejected this explanation in favor of the etymology *dies mali*. I am retaining his original etymology, while suggesting another semantic development.

⁷It would be erroneous to believe that the idea of 'unlucky day(s)' which came to be suggested by *dies decimales*, has anything to do with the number 10 in itself: to the contrary 10 (and 100, 1000) is, in medieval number symbolism, indicative of perfection and would not lend itself to interpretation as a bad omen. The custom of tithing itself (cf. the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. *tithes*) has its origin, with various peoples, in the mystical significance given to the number 10 which is supposed to represent totality (all the ciphers of the numeric system being contained therein)—the totality, therefore, of the goods given to man by God.

Perfection and completion could also be symbolized, however, by the number of days in the year (365 or 366), as may be seen from the *Chevalier as deus espees* (cf. Wendelin Foerster in his edition, p. 384): in the *Perlesvaus* (ed. Nitzze II, 204) we find a reference to the 366 knights belonging to King Arthur's Round Table (each one of whom was probably on watch for one day out of the year). And when we read in the *Mort de Garin le Loherain*: *Et de ses homes ont ocis trente et six* (Rauschmaier, *Über den figürlichen Gebrauch der Zahlen im Altfranz.*, p. 106) it would seem that we have clearly the proportions of a 'tithe.' (For medieval number symbolism in general, cf. the latest contribution of Curtius, *Rom. Forsch.* LIV, 141).

vis de hoc quadragesimae tempore est adhuc aliud quod possit intelligi A praesenti etenim die (*les Cendres*) usque ad paschalis solemnitatis gaudia sex hebdomadae veniunt: quarum videlicet dies quadraginta duo fiunt. Ex quibus dum sex dies dominici ab abstinentia subtrahuntur, non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex dies remanent. Dum vero per trecentos et sexaginta quinque dies annus ducitur, nos autem per triginta et sex dies affligimur, quasi anni nostri decimas Deo damus, ut qui nobis metipsis per acceptum annum viximus auctori nostro nos in ejus decimis per abstinentiam mortificemus. Unde, fratres carissimi, sicut offerre in lege jubemini decimas rerum, ita ei offerre contendite et decimas dierum" Un auteur grec du même temps ou un peu antérieur, l'archimandrite Doro-thée, traitant ce même sujet, montre, par un calcul très précis, que la dime en question est bien en effet le dixième, et le dixième mathématique des 365 jours de l'année, soit 36 jours 1/2. (*Bibliotheca maxima patrum*, V, 933). Pour plus de détails, voyez le *Rationale divinorum officiorum* de Durand* lib VI, cap. 28.

* I have not been able to consult Durand, but one may note the remarks of Dom Prosper Guéranger, "The Liturgical Year," in the volume entitled "Septuagesima" (Eng translation by Dom Laur. Shephard, 1892), concerning "the history of Septuagesima" (the three weeks immediately preceding Lent or *Quadragesima*):

"This prelude to the holy Season of Lent was not known in the early ages of Christianity its institution would seem to have originated in the Greek Church. Besides the six *Sundays* of Lent, on which by universal custom, the Faithful never fasted, the practice of this Church prohibited fasting on the Saturdays likewise, consequently their Lent was short, by twelve days, of the *Forty* spent by our Savior doing penance in the Desert To make up the deficiency, they were obliged to begin their Lent so many days earlier . . . The Church of Rome had no such motive for anticipating the season of those privations, which belong to Lent, for, from the earliest antiquity, she kept the Saturdays of Lent . . . as fasting days At the close of the 6th century, Saint Gregory the Great alludes, in one of his homilies [the 16th on the Gospels—the text quoted above], to the fast of Lent being less than Forty Days, owing to the Sundays which come during that holy season. . . It was, therefore, after the pontificate of Saint Gregory, that the last four days of Quinquagesima week [the third week of Septuagesima, immediately preceding Lent] were added to Lent, in order that the number of Fasting days might be exactly Forty. As early, however, as the 9th century, the custom of beginning Lent on Ash Wednesday was of obligation in the whole Latin Church"

• The name of *Septuagesima* which substituted the round figure for—in reality—the 63 days from Septuagesima Sunday to Easter, according to Guéranger ib p. 7 seq., symbolizes the 70 years of exile of the Israelites from Zion which represents to the view of the Church the captivity of man in *this* existence, the existence 'before Easter' (= before the Redemption). Caught between two symbolismisms the Church definitely opted for contempt of reality.

Thus our **dies decimales* (cf. the *decimae dierum*⁹ of Gregory) would correspond with the idea of giving a 'tithe' of our time to God. The line of the Provençal Sermons, *Ara es lo terminis . . .*

⁹ It seems significant that in the Umbrian confession formula of the 11th century (Monaci, *Orest. Ital.* n° 4) the two self-accusations of not paying the tithe and of not observing the fastings, are found together: "me accuso de la decema e de laprimizia e de offertione, ke nno la dei siccome far dibbi, me accuso de le sancte quadregesime e de le vigilie de l'apostoli et de le jejunia .IIII.^a tempora, k'io noll' osservai."

The following passage has perhaps no bearing on the problem of *decima dierum*, but serves to cast a light upon medieval symbolism concerning dates; it is taken from *La vie de Saint Thomas Becket* of Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, an author well-known for this type of symbolism: * after relating the martyrdom of St. Thomas à Becket, and the depredation of the church which ensued, the passage continues:

Binsi fu sainte iglise hunie e violee.
Ne matines ne vespres, messe n'i fu chantee,
Ne Deus n'i fu serviz, ne chandoille alumee.
Li uis furent fermé, al pueple fu vee;
Tut l'an fu sainte eglise ainsi emprisunee.
Fors sulement dis jours en failli de l'anee;
Quint jour apres Noël fu en prison getee,
Quint jour devant Noël refu reconfermee;
5699 Et del pueple e des jours fu la disme salvee
Et des clers e del rei [Henry] la bataille finee.

Walberg in his greater edition confesses that he does not understand line 5699; the Tobler-Lommatzsch dictionary lists the line s. v. *disme* under the heading 'tenth part,' but adds in parenthesis "Sinn?" One should note that *del pueple et des jours la disme* echoes the *al pueple . . . tut l'an* of v. 5694-95; here again we have a zeugmatic construction of 'people'

* For example, v. 5685, where, because of the fact that his protagonist St. Thomas à Becket was born on St. Thomas' Day, December 21st, 5 days before Christmas, and died 5 days after Christmas, December 29, he argues that the two saints of the Occident and Orient have divided among themselves 'Jerusalem [=the militant Church] and Christmas'. *Noel et Jursalem unt parti equalment* (cf. E. Walberg, *ZRPh* LI, 558).

Such parallel references to time and place follow the harmonizing habit of thought characteristic of the Fathers: "The Church . . . often speaks to us of two places, which correspond with the two times of Saint Augustine [the time 'before Easter' = before the Redemption, and 'after Easter' = the Christian age]. These two places are *Babylon* and *Jerusalem*. *Babylon* is the image of this world of sin, in the midst whereof the Christian has to spend his years of probation; *Jerusalem* is the heavenly country where he is to repose after all his privations" (Dom Guéranger, *loc. cit.*, p. 7).

is obviously written under the inspiration of Gregory's idea that Christians should spend a tenth part of the year in fasting and mortification of the flesh. Levy, it is true, is inclined to doubt the pertinence of Chabaneau's remarks (v. *Suppl.-Wb.* s. v. *desmar*): because in the particular phrase in our sentence, *desmar las carns*, the verb *desmar* is used to refer, not to time, but to the flesh, he would translate it simply by '*amoindrir*': 'to decimate, to diminish' (Mistral gives for Mod. Prov. *deima* the meanings 'dîner, décimer,' '*amoindrir*'). But in this way he disregards the underlying idea: "*now is the time*—to 'tax' the flesh." The phrase **decimare carnem* is but a variant of the phrase *exuere carnem* which, according to Saint Augustine (ep. 149, 26), expresses the duty of the christian who wants to follow Christ.

Christ sacrificed 40 days when fasting in the desert, and this is the origin of the *quadragesima* (> *carême*): the Lent during which Christianity fasts.^{9a} And one may explain the infrequency of the

and '[a section of] time' on one level—no more startling than that of 'Jerusalem and Christmas' of v. 5685. But it cannot be denied that the meaning of the word *disme* in the double reference of 5699 is puzzling. *Del pueple . . . la disme* is in itself rather understandable: after the detailed statements about the lack of services in the violated church, of lighted candles and of open doors, then one could naturally expect, as a contrast in the re-opened church, the re-establishment of the payment of the 'tithe' The best explanation of *des jours . . . la disme* seems to me perhaps that of a 'decade' of days (from the 5th day before Christmas to the 5th day after). At any rate, *disme* can hardly be 'the tenth part' as Tobler-Lommatzsch would propose. Since we have to cope with a zeugmatic trend of thought as well as with zeugmatic construction, we cannot expect that one translation of *disme* will suffice for this line.

^{9a} According to Dom Guéranger, *loc. cit.*, vol. "Lent," p. 31, there is a mountain named *Quarantina* where Christ retired during the fast. Saint Francis fasted 40 days and 40 nights like Christ (*Fioretti*, ch. vii)

References to the *quadragesima* abound in O. F. texts; cf. such a passage as *de la quarantaine jeuner nos done dex essample*; the frequent oaths of the type: *chil Sires t'aidera qui fist la quarantaine*, and, especially the lines 6051 seq. in Guernes' *Vie de St. Thomas Becket*, where we find the formal declaration: *par quaranteines sont li peché espeldri* (King Henry must expiate his crime of murder for 40 months + 40 weeks + 40 days); cf. E. Walberg's greater edition, p. 312, and Tobler-Lommatzsch s. v. *carantaine*.

A close parallel to the development of *dismal days* is to be found in the passage of the *Roman d'Alisandre* which this last-named dictionary quotes: "*en peneuse semaine Entrent li douze per et en fort quaranteine*"; here the *quaranteine* is obviously identified with *peneuse semaine*: it should not have been translated simply by 'Frist, Zeit.'

term **dies decimales* as due precisely to the standardization of *quadragesima*; since the same lapse of time is referred to by the two terms they are practically synonymous. Thus, for **dies decimales* there remained only a secondary usage.

Accordingly a *dies decimale* > *dis* (*jours*) *dismals*, or perhaps a neuter *decimale* (sc. *tempus* or *vectigal*: cf. in O. F. and in Mod. Swiss dialects a masculine *disme* = *decimus*), involving the idea of a 'tith of time,' must have involved the idea of a 'time of self-mortification'; this could apply specifically, not only to the Easter fasting period, but to any of the three *quadragesimae* usual in the Middle Ages (cf. H. Rheinfelder, *Kultsprache u. Profansprache*, p. 145: *quadragesima S. Martini, S. Joannis Baptistae* and *Quadragesima maior*); from the general idea of 'time of affliction,' one comes easily to that of 'gloomy, unhappy time, day(s)', which is the meaning of Eng. in the *dismal*.

Indeed, already in the O. F. text of 1256 where *dismal* is first attested,¹⁰ as well as in the O. Norse text of 1363 quoted by the *NED*, one may note an alteration of the first, religious meaning. As for the Chaucerian lines, these illustrate a confusion with the concept of the 'Egyptian days' (cf. Du Cange) that augur ill-luck. Since this tradition was of pagan origin, it was forbidden to the Christian; we may note, however, that P. Meyer, after publishing the lines on *jours denietz* (*dies nefasti*) and *dismal*, adds the comment:

Ce n'est pas qu'il [Rauf] paraisse bien persuadé de l'influence pernicieuse des jours néfastes, toutefois il ne laissera pas de les énumérer:

E sachetz que seint Augustin¹¹
 Qui fust mult de clergie fin
 En ses livres defent
 Ke garde ne preignent la gent.
 Ceo, dit il, ja ne gardez,
 Ne calende ne jour deniez.
 Ne purquant je les voil nomer
 Ke les lais ne me puissent blamer

Thus it would seem that, in 'lay' usage, the confusion of the *dies*

¹⁰ And here, in Rauf de Linham's text, we must count with an O. F. word—not with a "mot anglais," as Paul Meyer would have it.

¹¹ The actual text of Augustine may be found in Du Cange s. v. *dies aegyptiaci*.

Ægyptiaci (> Sp. *día aznago*, *REW* s. v. *ægyptiacus*)¹² with the *dies decimales* had perhaps already taken place: even by this time there prevailed the pagan idea of the 'unlucky day' preordained by some unchristian Fate—in contrast to the original meaning of a day or period of days given as a 'tithe of time' to God. It is possible that the 'etymology' *dies mali* may have been accepted by the community and have played its part in fixing the meaning of *dismal* in this direction—the pseudo-etymology thus becoming a linguistic reality with which, ultimately, the modern scholar must count. But this secondary influence should not obscure the primordial Christian idea of the **dies decimales*.¹³

LEO SPITZER

¹² Moreover the idea of 'Egyptian darkness' (*dies ægyptiaci* = *dies tenebrosi*) may have reinforced the suggestion of 'gloom' in *dismal*.—The plural in the dialectal phrases *to be in the dismals*, *a fit of the dismals* (Wright, *Engl. Dial. Dict.*: low temper, melancholy, despondency) points to the presence of the idea of 'days' in the popular mind.

¹³ Unfortunately I have not been able to attest *dies decimales* in any text. But, then, the O. F. text of 1256 is relatively late.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LVII

DECEMBER, 1942

Number 8

THE FENCING ACTOR-LINES IN SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS

In his *Organization and Personnel of the Shakesperean Company*¹ Professor Baldwin has noted that there is a sequence of duelling parts in several of Shakspeare's plays. He paid little attention to this in assigning parts to Burbadge, Sly, and Pope. A study of the uses Shakspeare made of fencing has revealed that there are sequences of parts which demand considerable fencing skill and that these sequences correspond almost exactly to three of the actor-lines which Professor Baldwin has traced on other evidence.

Ordish described in his *Early London Theatres*² the strong influence which the use of the playhouses for fencing exhibitions had on the plays of the period. He notes that the Elizabethan drama grew up amid the ancient and traditional sports and pastimes of the people. . . . To understand these conditions is to understand why . . . broadsword, buckler . . . [and] rapier were brought into the dramatist's story. . . . The fight between Macbeth and Macduff must have been a wonderful spectacle.³

Dr. L. K. Wright has traced the use of fencing in the theatres,⁴ and indicates that a high degree of skill was usual. The technique of the "single short sword" had developed much beyond the buckler stage, as the superb *Bref Instructions Upon My Paradoxes of Defense* of George Silver indicates; fencers recognize it⁵ as the earliest statement of the parry-riposte technique, the basis of the

¹ Princeton, 1927, p. 252.

² New York, 1894.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff.

⁴ L. K. Wright, "Stage Duelling in the Elizabethan Theatre," *MLR.*, xxii (1927), 265.

⁵ See Cyril G. R. Matthey, ed., *The Works of George Silver* (London, 1898), p. ix.

very effective modern Hungarian technique.⁶ The rapier techniques of di Grassi and Saviolo were also very efficient,⁷ as experiment on the fencing floor has demonstrated. 'Technique' is used here to indicate not skill alone but rather the combination of skill, speed, timing and decisiveness which still distinguish the fine fencer from the mediocre one. That Shakspeare was aware of the combination of bodily skill with other physical qualities is apparent in Sir Toby's descriptions of Sir Andrew Aguecheek's fencing technique: Andrew has "rage, skill, fury, and impetuosity"; he is "quick, skilful, and deadly"; and he has what "youth, strength, skill, and wrath can furnish man."⁸

We may be sure, then, that if there were sword and rapier techniques to be learned by long practice, and if the audiences demanded expert shows as Mr. Wright declares, there undoubtedly were expert fencers in the Shakspearean company to act the important fencing parts. A clear proof of the skill required is the important exchange of weapons in *Hamlet*; long practice with the weapons has convinced the present writer that great skill is required to be able invariably to force an exchange by the Elizabethan method, left hand seizure.⁹

As is well known, at least nine of the plays have the leading character, often the player of the title role, engaging in combat to determine physically a social or political struggle. *Hamlet*¹⁰ and Richard III¹¹ are excellent examples of this fencing lead character, as is Prince Hal.¹² Romeo has two bouts,¹³ one quite important; and Richard Plantagenet wins his important combat.¹⁴ *Macbeth* is clearly one of these fencing leads,¹⁵ and brave Talbot

⁶ Silver's fine manual of sword-fighting is not known to have been published in his lifetime, but the fact that his parry-riposte technique did not reappear until 250 years after his death indicates that it probably was not.

⁷ Especially Saviolo's, which is very well thought out and quite successful against di Grassi's science.

⁸ *Twelfth Night*, III, iv, 202, 234, 242.

⁹ Di Grassi, *True Arte* sigs Aa, Bb. Saviolo, *His Practice*, sigs F, F_s, F_a, G_a, H_a. Silver, *Bref Instructions*, Cap. 4: "The manner of certain gryps and clozes to be used at the single short sword fight, &." •

¹⁰ *Hamlet*, v, ii, 240-307.

¹¹ *Richard III*, v, iv, 14.

¹² *1 Henry IV*, v, iv, 68-86.

¹³ *Romeo and Juliet*, III, i, 124 ff., 145-168; v, 3, 71.

¹⁴ *3 Henry VI*, II, iv, 11; II, vi, 40.

¹⁵ *Macbeth*, v, vii, 37-83.

defeats the Dauphin and fights a draw with Joan of Arc.¹⁶ Posthumus is the dominating soldier of *Cymbeline*; ¹⁷ and Coriolanus has the victory over Aufidius.¹⁸

It is apparent that in these nine plays the fencing leads meet, and overcome in seven of the nine, certain opposition characters such as Laertes, who is Hamlet's foil, and Richmond, who defeats Richard III offstage. Hotspur is contrasted to Prince Hal throughout *1 Henry IV* and is his fencing opposition. Tybalt is slain in rapier ¹⁹ fight by Romeo; although Tybalt has been built up as Romeo's enemy, Paris is actually Romeo's rival in love. Clifford is defeated by Richard Plantagenet; and while Macduff triumphs over the fencing lead, Macbeth, the bout probably ends offstage, which might indicate that the lead was the stronger fencer. Talbot defeats his political opponent, the Dauphin. While the part of Jachimo in *Cymbeline* is not as large as most of the opposition parts, he is defeated in a fairly important combat with the fencing lead, Posthumus. Aufidius is defeated by Coriolanus, although the combat is not an integral part of the play structure as is, for example, the bout in *Hamlet*. And in addition to the two main lines, the fencing lead, usually triumphant, and the fencing opposition, defeated in all but two of the nine plays, there is a third line of two important parts, Mercutio ²⁰ and Falstaff.²¹

The motif of the fencing lead triumphing after a struggle during the play is clearly seen in the Hal-Hotspur combat. And in the nine plays whose fencing leads we have listed there are but two reversals of this motif: Richard III, the fencing lead, it is implied, is defeated offstage by the reenforced Richmond; ²² and Macbeth

¹⁶ *1 Henry VI*, I, v, 1; I, v, 8, 13.

¹⁷ V, ii, 1-7, 18-26

¹⁸ *Coriolanus*, I, viii, 15 ff.

¹⁹ The weapons of the bouts may be determined by the context; e.g., "lay on Macduff" and "warlike shield" (*Macbeth*, v, viii, 40) indicate sword and buckler, and "tilting" (*Othello*, II, iii, 183) aptly describes rapier fence. The names of weapons as used in the texts are not to be trusted, for while Shakspeare usually used "rapier" in the limited sense he often used "sword" when meaning the rapier, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, i, 115, and *Hamlet*, IV, vii, 140.

²⁰ *Romeo and Juliet*, III, i, 79-109.

²¹ *1 Henry IV*, V, iv, 76; *2 Henry IV*, II, iv, 217, 229.

²² The F₁ stage-direction in *Richard III* (V, iv, 14) indicates that when Richmond reenters after the combat Stanley is with him and is bearing

is defeated also offstage, by the opposition character Macduff. In both of these plays the defeat of the lead is made almost inevitable by the exigencies of the plots. There are excellent indications in the F_1 stage-directions of the two combats which reverse the motif that both of them end offstage, and this may indicate that the fencing lead had shown himself to be the stronger and more skilful fencer. The audience would then accept his defeat only if it occurred offstage.

We know that Burbadge played the parts of Hamlet and Richard III,²³ and we may thus establish him as the actor of the line of fencing leads; this corresponds exactly to Professor Baldwin's assignment to him of the same parts; Hamlet, Richard III, Prince Hal, Romeo, Richard Plantagenet, Macbeth, Talbot, Posthumus, and Coriolanus. The only character of this line on which Professor Baldwin is doubtful is Posthumus, for either Posthumus or Cymbeline might be Burbadge's part;²⁴ but the fact that Posthumus is required to do the important fencing indicates him as part of Burbadge's line of fencing leads.

The line of the fencing oppositions seems almost certainly to have been that of William Sly, for Professor Baldwin assigns six of the nine opposition parts to him: Laertes, Hotspur, Tybalt, Clifford, Macduff, and the Dauphin. It is interesting that Professor Baldwin assigns two of the remaining three opposition parts, Jachimo and Aufidius, to one actor, John Lowin. In both cases the lead has an easy victory, for Jachimo is vanquished and disarmed and Aufidius is driven out even when reënforced by "certain Volces." Lowin, then, was probably not nearly so strong or skilful a fencer as Sly. The remaining opposition part, Richmond, Professor Baldwin assigns to Henry Cundall; and in this play, *Richard III*, Sly probably played no part. Professor Baldwin assigns to Thomas Pope both of the remaining fairly important parts, Falstaff and Mercutio.

We find that the important rapier and sword parts probably fell almost entirely²⁵ to two men, Burbadge and Sly, who, from the contexts of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* and what we know of Elizabethan stage fencing, must have been excellent fencers. Lewin

the crown; this might very possibly have indicated to the audience that Richmond could have had and probably did have Stanley's assistance.

²³ *Shakespeare Allusion Book*, v. 2, pp. 271, 272, of the 1932 edition.

²⁴ *Organization and Personnel of the Shakesperean Company*, p. 238.

²⁵ Fifteen of twenty important parts.

seems to have taken over the line of opposition parts from Sly in playing Jachimo and Aufidius. As Mercutio, and (less so) as Falstaff, Pope must have been able to give a good exhibition.

An interesting corollary to the main fencing lines is the fact that the great majority of parts which speak knowingly of fencing and are assumed by the audience to be fencers without actually fencing on the stage are assigned by Professor Baldwin on his evidence to the company's three fencers: Burbadge, Sly, and Pope. Burbadge makes fencing references as Lear, Bassanio, Bertram, Anthony, and Claudio. As Lear he declares

I have seen the day, with my good biting falchion
I would have made them skip; I am old now,
And these same crosses spoil me.²⁶

The falchion, already out of date in Shakspeare's time, admirably suggests Lear's age; and the "crosses" which confuse or damage him may be not only his misfortunes but also the true blade-parries for sword fighting which Silver had developed.²⁷ As Bassanio, Burbadge is assigned an excellent figure from fencing; he declares, in speaking of Portia's ring,

Why, I were best to cut my left hand off,
And swear I lost the ring defending it.²⁸

This almost certainly refers to the dangers the left hand incurred in the ambidextrous rapier play even when protected by a glove. As Bertram, by Professor Baldwin's assignments, Burbadge refers to the light dancing rapier, which stout rapiersmen despised, in speaking of

no sword worn
But one to dance with.²⁹

Burbadge refers to the dancing rapier again as Anthony:

he [Caesar] at Philippi kept
His sword e'en like a dancer.³⁰

and it is also in *Anthony and Cleopatra* that he sternly admonishes

²⁶ *Lear*, v, iii, 278 ff.

²⁷ Silver uses "cross" frequently for "parry," along with "ward"; more often he uses "cross" as a verb to describe the motion of parrying. See his *Bref Instructions*, Cap. 3, par. 4; Cap. 4, par. 16. The word occurs very seldom in the rapier manuals of di Grassi and Saviolo.

²⁸ *Merchant of Venice*, v, i, 177.

²⁹ *All's Well That Ends Well*, II, ii, 32.

³⁰ *Anthony and Cleopatra*, III, xi, 35.

his men to bear their "hack'd targets like the men that owe them."³¹ And in *Much Ado About Nothing* there is no indication of how old Leonato knows that Claudio, played by Burbadge, has "nice fence . . . and active practice."³² This must then almost certainly be a carry-over from the personal accomplishments of Burbadge himself.³³

William Sly also has fence-speaking parts in addition to his true fencing parts. As Sebastian, Sly is drawn and ready to fight with Sir Toby;³⁴ and as Roderigo in *Othello* he makes the ineffectual rush at Cassio.³⁵ He also played the parts of Edmund³⁶ by Professor Baldwin's assignments, going down in quick defeat before Cundall's Edgar.³⁷

Thomas Pope, playing Armado according to Professor Baldwin, describes a play of wit in a swordsman's terms, "a sweet touch, a quick venew of wit";³⁸ and earlier³⁹ he refers to his Spanish rapier, to the causes and the *passado*. As Benedick he answers Margaret's filip of wit on the fencers' blunt foils by yielding her the bucklers.⁴⁰ Pope as Parolles is accused by Helena of going back too much in his fighting, a great insult.⁴¹ Sir Toby, assigned by Professor Baldwin to Pope, speaks with a knowledge of rapier fence in his advice to Viola,⁴² in his description of his pass "rapier, scabbard, and all,"⁴³ and in threatening Sebastian⁴⁴ with disarmament.⁴⁵

³¹ *Ibid.*, iv, viii, 31.

³² v, i, 75.

³³ Cf. also *Taming of the Shrew*, i, i, 235; *Tempest*, v, i, 84.

³⁴ *Twelfth Night*, iv, i, 42.

³⁵ *Othello*, v, i, 24.

³⁶ *Lear*, v, iii, 152. As Edgar is not the central character of the play he is not included among the fencing leads.

³⁷ Cf. also *1 Henry VI*, i, ii, 105; *Taming of the Shrew*, iii, ii, 48.

³⁸ *Love's Labour's Lost*, v, i, 59.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, i, ii, 186 ff.; cf. also v, ii, 709 ff.

⁴⁰ *Much Ado About Nothing*, v, ii, 17.

⁴¹ *All's Well That Ends Well*, i, i, 217.

⁴² *Twelfth Night*, iii, iv, 220.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, iii, ix, 274. The scabbard was probably intended to take the place of dagger or glove as a left-hand defensive weapon; di Grassi advises (sig. E) using a "stool or form from a sword" if no conventional weapon is available.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, iv, i, 29. From Sebastian's "Let go thy hand" (line 30) it seems likely that Toby was intended actually to take a seizure on Sebastian's weapon preparatory to disarming him.

⁴⁵ Cf. also *1 Henry VI*, iv, i, 116; *King John*, ii, i, 290; iii, ii, 1; iv, iii, 99.

This includes almost all the fencing references but omits the many small fencing parts; enough has probably been shown to indicate that Shakspeare consciously planned his plays to utilize the three good fencers in the main fencing parts. It also seems likely that he unconsciously⁴⁶ carried this planning into the parts which speak knowingly of fencing but are only assumed to be fencers, for by Professor Baldwin's assignments the great majority of these parts also fall to the company's three fencers.

JAMES L. JACKSON

University of Illinois

THE RECEPTION OF *MODERN PAINTERS*

By the time of his death in 1900, John Ruskin had arrived at a degree of fame so considerable that it was impossible for his admirers to conceive his not having enjoyed popularity and authority from the very outset. And among his admirers must be counted his principal biographers, W. G. Collingwood and E. T. Cook, as well as the editors of the admirable Library Edition of his works.¹ Between them, these men have published what is to date the one indispensable body of fact about Ruskin, and until recently their interpretation of the facts has influenced nearly every subsequent student. According to their reading of the evidence, Ruskin enjoyed from 1843 an almost immediate success and influence which turned the tide of Turner criticism, so that subsequent to 1843 Turner came to be more or less immediately understood and appreciated, even though his later manner had with few intermissions since 1836 been coldly received.² In 1933, however, R. H. Wilenski,

⁴⁶ The fact that the great majority of the parts assumed to be fencers are played by Burbadge, Sly, and Pope may actually have been conscious planning on the part of the dramatist. This would be desirable if the audience were, from frequent attendance, familiar with the fencing skill of these three, and this may have been the case. See *Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearian Company*, p. 173.

¹ *Life and Works* by W. G. Collingwood, London, 1892; *Life*, by E. T. Cook, London, 1911; *Works*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, London, 1903-12.

² *Lib* ed., III, p. xxxiii; Cook, I, 138; Collingwood, I, 130 ff. Writing in 1851, Ruskin himself said in a postscript to *Modern Painters*, I: "The abuse of the press, which had been directed against Turner with unceasing

relying upon evidence contained in the Library Edition, challenged this traditional view by contending that Ruskin's public was small, his influence slight until after Turner's death in 1851.³ Obviously the evidence on both sides of the question requires re-examination.

Ruskin's first books, the first two volumes of *Modern Painters*, were widely reviewed, and only two reviews of each were definitely hostile.⁴ Other reviews Cook and the Library Edition report as universally favorable, and from the excerpts given it appears these volumes enjoyed a press reception very flattering to so young a critic. Examination of the reviews, however, reveals that the praise was not so unqualified as the quotations imply. Many of the reviewers saw in the books a fresh and philosophical approach to the subject, linked with thorough knowledge.⁵ The poetry of expression and the general cleverness of the books also received notice, not always favorable.⁶ But in one criticism there was a surprising unanimity among the reviews: more or less vehemently

virulence during the production of his noblest works, sank into timid animadversion, or changed into unintelligent praise, but not before illness, and, in some degree, mortification, had enfeebled the hand and chilled the heart of the painter" (Lib. ed. III, 631).

³ *John Ruskin* by R. H. Wilenski (London, 1933), 50 and 369 ff. Ruskin is said to have been "an isolated amateur in the art world" whose books were little read except by literary people who were captivated by its style and by its defense of Turner, artists and the bourgeois ignored him.

⁴ Lib. ed., III, p. xlii; IV, p. xlii. Hostile reviews of *MP.*, I, appeared in *Blackwoods* and the *Athenaeum*; of *MP.*, II, in the *Athenaeum* and the *Daily News*. The bibliography (xxxviii) lists fourteen reviews of *MP.*, I, six of *MP.*, II, and nine of the two together.

⁵ *Artist and Amateur's Magazine*, I, 257; *Art Union* (1843), p. 151; *Gentleman's Magazine*, Ser. 3, XX, 451; *Church of England Quarterly*, XV, 213; *Spectator*, XVII, 1167; *North British Review*, VI, 401; *Prospective Review*, III, 213; *Eccelesiastic*, III, 212; *Churchman*, VIII, 671; *North American Review*, LXVI, 110; *British Quarterly Review*, X, 441. One of the commonest remarks about *MP.* was that it opened the eyes of readers to natural phenomena.

⁶ *Artist and Amateur's Magazine*, *British Quarterly Review*, *North British Review*, and *Foreign Quarterly Review*, XXXVII, 202, agreed in substance with the reviewer for the *Prospective Review*, who declared Ruskin's style "habitually vehement rather than vigorous, more conspicuous for an accumulation of epithets and emotions than for lucid statements of intellectual repose, poetical, but bordering on that species of Poetry which a witty Poet has called 'prose run mad.'" The strictures of *Blackwoods* and the *Athenaeum* upon Ruskin's style are too well known to require repetition.

they all rejected Ruskin's thesis that Turner, especially in his despised later manner, excelled all other landscape painters.⁷

Early Victorian journals and letters reveal a similar division of opinion concerning Ruskin's first work. All the early readers of *Modern Painters* whose first impressions are a matter of record were favorably impressed, although few felt the author's judgments were always trustworthy. What recommended the volumes to many readers was apparently the extraordinarily accurate observation of natural phenomena described with unusual vividness.⁸ More than that, they found food for thought in the new writer's principles of art criticism. The consensus of opinion seems to have been that the author was well worth reading even though the readers reserved the right to be more or less dubious about his opinions.⁹ Nor were the readers exclusively "literary" people, for according to *Praeterita* Fielding, Prout, Stanfield, Harding, DeWint, and Richmond read at least so much of Ruskin's books as concerned themselves and, self-esteem being what it is, dissented.¹⁰ The books seem also to have been read enthusiastically by the painters of the next generation, still undergraduates when *Modern Painters* was new: William Morris, Holman Hunt, and Edward Burne-Jones.¹¹

⁷ Reviews in the *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review*, II, 633, *Westminster Review*, XI, 239, and *Edinburgh Review*, LXXXVII, 483, agree with reviews already mentioned. *Fraser's Magazine*, XXXIII, 367, may be said to speak for all the reviews in saying: "To the truth of all its principles we accord the fullest and most entire submission; on the perfect justness of all its illustrations we may not, with such unhesitating trust, rely."

⁸ *Frederick James Furnivall*, Oxford, 1911, xxii; *The Brontës*, ed. T. J. Wise, Oxford, 1932, II, 240; *Recollections of a Literary Life* by M. R. Mitford, London, 512; *Memoir and Letters of Sara Coleridge*, London, 1873, II, 61; *Letters of E. B. Browning*, ed. F. G. Kenyon, London, 1898, I, 384; *Life of F. D. Maurice*, New York, 1884, II, 66.

⁹ Crabb Robinson, who admired MP. greatly, describes Ruskin as "a subtle writer and fastidious critic, who gives offense by his peculiar opinions and a contemptuous tone towards others." (*Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle*, Oxford, 1927, II, 780). Essentially the same verdict appeared in *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford*, ed. Henry Chorley, London, 1872, II, 23; *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson* ed. Stopford Brooke, New York, 1870, 242; *Life of William Wordsworth* by William Knight, Edinburgh, 1889, II, 334. Charlotte Brontë, Sara Coleridge, and Mrs. Browning also concurred.

¹⁰ Lab. ed., XXXV, 401; III, p. xlii and 631 ff.

¹¹ *Life of William Morris* by J. W. Mackail, New York, 1907, I, 38; *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood*, by W. H. Hunt, London,

It appears from this evidence that Ruskin's first works were, as his editors and early biographers insisted, well received in that a flattering amount of space was devoted to reviews, in that a flattering number of famous readers thought highly enough of them to record their impressions in letters and journals, and in that even the unfavorable reviews paid them the compliment of disagreeing at length. The reviews and word-of-mouth recommendations seem to have borne fruit in sales, for of the first volume of *Modern Painters* five editions appeared between 1843 and 1851, when Turner died, and of the second volume three editions appeared between 1846 and 1851.¹² There remains, however, the question of whether they influenced the reputation of Turner among the art critics reviewing the spring exhibitions of the Royal Academy.

Until 1836 Turner's reviews from these critics were for the most part favorable; even *Blackwoods* and the *Athenaeum* were respectful if not always enthusiastic.¹³ After 1836, however, favorable reviews were the exception rather than the rule. Even the *Spectator*, always more enthusiastic about Turner than *Blackwoods* and the *Athenaeum*, ceased in 1836 to review Turner at length and to place reviews of his pictures at the head of the landscape section.¹⁴ In succeeding years, Turner's press notices became less and less favorable in all periodicals carrying reviews of current exhibitions. Most commonly he was accused of slovenly finish, exaggerating the

1905, I, 73 (Hunt borrowed Cardinal Wiseman's copy and read hastily, but still felt as though the work had been composed especially for him); *Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones* by G. Burne-Jones, New York, 1906, 79.

¹² I have been unable to establish finally the size of the editions, but Wilenski's estimate (*op. cit.*, 370) that none of them exceeded 500 seems too conservative. The memoir of George Smith in the *DNB*, Supplement, I, p. xx, states the first edition of *MP*, II was 1500; that being so, it seems likely that editions of both volumes after 1846 were issued at least to that number. The same authority calls *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849) the first of Ruskin's works to be greeted with "practical warmth," which seems to indicate that after 1849 even larger editions might have been justified.

¹³ As late as 1835 the *Athenaeum*, 394, found two Turner pictures admirable. *Blackwoods*, xxxviii, 200, found the same pictures reprehensible, but the real attack came in 1836, when the *Athenaeum* printed the review of "Juliet and Her Nurse" which was the genesis of *MP*, and *Blackwoods* published an equally biting essay on "The British School of Painting."

¹⁴ *Spectator*, ix, 516.

facts of natural form and color, allowing a once fine natural genius to run mad, either wilfully in defiance of common sense and public opinion, or unconsciously through some subtle disease of the senses which no longer permitted him to see and report the facts of nature as they appeared to ordinary eyes.¹⁵ All the reviews admitted that Turner's great genius had once produced pictures both poetical and factually accurate. What they objected to was the artist's increasing tendency to paint the unpaintable in such a fashion as to mystify the beholder accustomed to the more pedestrian efforts of conservative artists. Only one picture exhibited during this period was exempt from the universal condemnation, "The Fighting Temeraire," first shown in 1839; and here it was the patriotic note struck by the subject rather than anything in the artist's conception or execution which made the picture attractive.¹⁶

After publication of *Modern Painters* critics continued to object to Turner's later manner, exaggerated coloring, slap-dash execution, and general lack of intelligibility.¹⁷ Only a few reviews showed unmistakable familiarity with Ruskin's defense of Turner, and those doubted whether even so eloquent special pleading could make agreeable to the public vagaries so outrageous as those of the aging Turner.¹⁸ Even the Turner obituaries, when they did more than summarize his career, continued the tradition of bewailing the decline in old age of powers which once had made him head of the English school of landscape artists.¹⁹ In view of these facts, the conclusion seems inevitable that the critical fraternity remained deaf to Ruskin's defense of his favorite painter. And what writers in some of the most powerful journals of the day expressed as their considered opinion must have found reflection in the opinions of many gallery-going Englishmen.

¹⁵ *Athenaeum*, 1837, p. 330; 1838, p. 347; 1840, p. 400; 1842, p. 433; *Blackwoods*, XLII, 335; XLVI, 312; XLVIII, 380; I, 342; *Quarterly Review*, LXII, 144; *Gentleman's Magazine*, Ser. 3, XII, 66; XIV, 178; *Spectator*, XIV, 765; *ibid.*, x, 498; *ibid.*, XI, 446; *Art Union*, II, 73; IV, 120 ff.; V, 161 ff.

¹⁶ *Art Union*, I, 67; *Athenaeum*, 1839, p. 357; *Spectator*, XII, 447; *Blackwoods*, XLVI, 312.

¹⁷ *Spectator*, XVI, 451; XVII, 451; XVIII, 498; *Art Union*, VI, 155; VII, 181; VIII, 173; *Athenaeum*, 1844, p. 433; 1845, p. 496; 1846, p. 480; 1847, p. 495; *Edinburgh Review*, LXXXVII, 485.

¹⁸ *Blackwoods*, LIV, 192; *Edinburgh Review*, LXXXVII, 485; *Athenaeum*, 1845, p. 496.

¹⁹ *Athenaeum*, 1851, p. 1382; *Examiner*, 1851, p. 822; *Gentleman's Magazine*, Ser. 3, XXXVII, 198.

So far at least the evidence seems to bear out Wilenski's contention that Ruskin's works had no practical effects until after 1860. Yet the public for his first works was not so insignificant and his reception was not so cold as Wilenski implies. The first volume of *Modern Painters* was frankly controversial and both volumes dealt with matters not previously treated in such a fashion as to appeal to the nineteenth-century layman. Although they produced no startling about-face in public taste, they exerted the appeal which controversy always makes to the thoughtful mind. Ruskin's debut seems to have been a moderate success for the writer even though it was something very like a failure for the critic.

The University of Illinois

LESTER DOLK

TWO UNPUBLISHED POEMS BY MARK AKENSIDE

In the Advertisement to *The Poems of Mark Akenside, M. D.* (London, 1772), the editor, Jeremiah Dyson, wrote: "This Volume contains a complete Collection of the poems of the late Dr. Akenside, either reprinted from the original Editions, or faithfully published from Copies which had been prepared by himself for publication." That this edition is far from complete has long been recognized; Dyce included in his edition¹ eight poems not printed in Dyson's collection, and recently the manuscripts of two more poems not published by Dyson have been found in Dyson's own copy of his friend's works.² I give the text of these poems below.

ODE

to Sir Francis-Henry Drake,³ Bart
January, M.DCC.XLIX. O.S.

I.

While by the order of the day,
Next week, the House & Speaker pray

¹ *The Poetical Works of Mark Akenside*, Aldine Edition, edited by Alexander Dyce (London, 1835).

² Formerly in the libraries of Charles J. Groves of Boston and Charles L. Dana, this volume was sold on Nov. 6, 1940 by the Parke-Bernet Galleries, 30 East 57th St., New York—see their catalogue 225, page 2.

³ Sir Francis Henry Drake (1723-1794), 5th Baronet, of Buckland and

That heaven may ne'er, at Britain's hand,
 The royal martyr's life demand,
 While Bentham⁴ labours much in vain
 The rights of freedom to maintain
 With good Saint Charles's blessed reign;

2.

Then, Drake, to Hampstead haste away,
 Where Dyson spends with me the day.
 And try if Hardinge cannot find
 That fate hath just one more design'd:
 Townshend is digging at his farm,
 Nor would a loud promiscuous swarm
 Or thee, or any of us charm.

3.

I hate the table & the treat
 Where friends, beset with strangers, meet;
 Where prudent form the tongue restrains
 From uttering what the heart contains;
 While, in your own despite, your eyes
 Tell how importantly you prize
 The deep discourse which round you flies.

4.

But say, from orators ador'd,
 From every heir to every board
 From Egmont's pathos, Warren's fights,
 And Nugent's tragi-comic flights,⁵
 Can'st thou an hour's attention steal
 To talk with me of England's weal,
 And smile at my untutor'd zeal?

Nutwell Court, Co. Devon. He was M. P. for Beeralston from 1747-1774, a seat held previously by his father. He was actually descended from a brother of the famous Admiral, not the Admiral himself as Akenside later implies. See *The Complete Baronetage*, edited by G. E. C. (Exeter, 1900) i 208.

⁴ Perhaps James Bentham (1708-1794) the historian, although his most famous work, his history of Ely, was not begun until 1756, nor completed until after Akenside's death.

⁵ John Perceval, 2nd Earl of Egmont (1711-1770), famous as an orator, and Robert Nugent (1702-1788), later Earl Nugent, famous for his wit and humor, were both leaders in the opposition at this time. Admiral Sir Peter Warren, K. B. (1703-1752), the captor of Louisbourg, had failed to secure the governorship of New Jersey from Akenside's⁶ hero, Henry Pelham, and so may also have been in the opposition.

5.

Then, if too grave the subject grow,
 (Foreboding aught we fear to know)
 To bring more pleasing prospects home,
 Thro' distant ages we can roam;
 When Athens spurn'd the Persian chain;
 When thy fam'd grandsire aw'd the main,
 Or Somers⁶ guided William's reign.

6.

Thence may we turn to calmer views,
 The haunts of science & the Muse;
 To groves where Milton walks alone,
 To Bacon's philosophic throne;
 Or where those Attic themes we find,
 The moral law, the almighty mind,
 And man for future worlds design'd.

7.

O Drake, in spite of all the zeal
 Which for the public oft we feel,
 When I before the shrine of fame
 Present some English patriot's name,
 Or when thy nobler cares demand
 How England's genius safe may stand
 From usury's insatiate hand;

8.

Yet, if blind selfishness can^{*} foil
 Both Barnard's⁷ hope & Pelham's toil,
 Surely the happiest hours below,
 (Which yet must from the public flow)

⁶ John Somers, Lord Somers (1651-1716), was made Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in 1693, Lord Chancellor in 1697, and held many other important posts under William III and Queen Anne.

^{*} The attempts to defeat the reduction of the interest of the national debt. [Akenside's note.]

⁷ Sir John Barnard (1685-1764), a member of Parliament for almost 40 years, proposed a plan for reducing the interest on the national debt to Walpole in March, 1737, but because of popular feeling against it, it was rejected. Upon becoming Prime Minister, Henry Pelham, however, supported the plan, and it was adopted by Parliament in November, 1749, to be put into effect by the following February 28. A pamphlet, published about the time this poem was written, entitled *Considerations on the Proposals for the Reduction of the National Debt* was attributed to Barnard. See the *Gentleman's Magazine* xix (Dec. 1749), 568; xx (Feb. 1750), 54, 96. For all the men mentioned in this poem, see the *DNB*.

The hours, which most sincerely please,
 Belong to private scenes like these,
 To friendship & to letter'd ease.

EPODE

O parent of the Muses, who alone,
 From Time's destructive might, hast pow'r to save
 The works of man; O Memory, behold
 This votive tablet, which the faithful hand
 Of Cleoptron suspends amid thy dome. [5]
 Accept the gift, propitious; & preserve
 The record which it holds, the voice & prayer
 Of jealous fame For by ignoble feet
 Soon will thy courts be trampled, & the tongues
 Of Hippias and Thrax with sland'rous rites [10]
 Affront thy altar. But permit not thou,
 O queen, their unblest envy to impair
 Thy servant's name; or from his duteous cares
 To turn thy gracious notice Long their arts,
 Their snares distributed thro' vulgar paths, [15]
 Neglecting hath he scorn'd; secure of thee,
 Secure that never thine eternal gates
 The rude access [*sic*] of ignorance & rage
 Would suffer. But behold; the favour'd bard
 Who lately this heroic mansion trod, [20]
 Thy priest, with evil auspices to them
 Hath left the charge his off'rings to present
 Before thy footstool Fierce with his commands,
 Ev'n now presumptuous up thy awful heights
 They come; with mutual flatt'ry sounding forth [25]
 That honour much unhop'd; & fell revenge
 To each gainsayer, & envenom'd wounds
 To all who spurn'd erewhile their sordid toils,
 Denouncing. But, immortal matron, say;
 Wilt thou accept them? wilt thou stoop to hear [30]
 The worship of blasphemers? No. by all
 The sacred Manes dearest to thy reign,
 By all the praise of sages, patriots, kings,
 Dash their foul homage; & let equal shame
 Repay the profanation. So well-pleas'd [35]
 Shall purer votaries, throughout the bounds
 Of Albion's land, to thy asserted throne
 Do rev'rence. So shall my devoted song
 Nor day nor night refuse to deck thy shrine
 With trophies won from envy & from death. [40]

The first of these poems is thoroughly characteristic of Akenside and the time at which it was written. In so far as it is an invitation to meet and converse at the time of year devoted to remembering the execution of Charles I, it reminds one of the ode to Dr. Caleb Hardinge (Book I, Ode xvi). In each poem Akenside states quite clearly his liberal, Whiggish attitude towards the contrast between freedom and the reign of Charles I (an attitude he saw no need to revise in his poems, even though he is said to have become a Tory about 1760). The weather, however, indicates that the poems were written in different years, for in the printed ode the wintry rains drove Akenside to town, while in the other he invites his friends to the country!

Akenside's expression of a love of retirement and friendly conversation is echoed from his "Ode on the Winter Solstice" (Book I, Ode ii) and "Hymn to Cheerfulness" (Book I, Ode vi, particularly lines 145-162). Even more common in the eighteenth century was the idea that courts, levees, parliaments, where everyone is trying to outdo everyone else, lead one to be trivial and insincere—an idea also expressed in the printed "Ode to Sir Francis Henry Drake, Baronet" (Book I, Ode xii) and the first "Ode to the Honourable Charles Townshend" (Book I, Ode xiv).

The topics of conversation which Akenside suggested to Drake were his favorites—"England's weal," freedom and its champions in antiquity and in England, "science and the Muse," and topics of ethics and metaphysics. The men whom he mentions as examples from the past (Bacon, Milton, William III and Lord Somers) all appear in other odes.

The second poem apparently deals with the two main attacks made on Akenside in print during his lifetime. It is an appeal to Memory to protect her votary Cleoptron (Akenside) from the attacks of Hippias and Thrax (presumably Dr. Alexander Monro and Bishop Warburton).⁸ "The favour'd bard" (line 19) appears to be Thomas Edwards, who had died in 1757, seven years after his famous attack on Warburton in *The Canons of Criticism*. The date of the poem would seem, then, to be about 1758, when Akenside was preparing his reply to Dr. Monro,⁹ and was perhaps fearing

⁸ The use of *Hippias*, the name of a famous sophist of Plato's time, suggests that Akenside thought Monro a pedant; *Thrax*, literally a *Thracian*, was also the name of a type of gladiator—an appropriate idea when applied to Warburton.

⁹ *Notes on the Postscript to a Pamphlet intitled, "Observations Anatomical"*

some attack from Warburton. Although Akenside later published his ode to Edwards,¹⁰ which is much more specific in its references to Warburton, the dislike of controversy in print expressed in this "Epode" is, I think, characteristic of Akenside, in spite of the reputation he had for controversy in conversation. It was this distaste, it seems to me, that kept him from publishing his ode to Edwards for fifteen years after he first composed it.

Just why these poems were not published by Dyson is not clear, especially since seven odes are missing to complete the two books of twenty odes each which Akenside intended to produce. These two poems are not among Akenside's best productions, but they are no poorer than some of the odes included for the first time by Dyson. The manuscript of the first poem is a fair copy in Akenside's hand, intended, as far as one can tell from the manuscript itself, for publication. The second manuscript is in Dyson's hand, and has the notation "In the possession of Dr. Hardinge," so that possibly Dyson acquired it too late to include it. In any case, however, these poems are interesting as further evidence that Dyson's edition of his friend's works is not as complete as he indicates in his Advertisement.

RALPH M. WILLIAMS

Wellesley College

ETYMOLOGIES OF OLD FRENCH *REECHIER* AND ENGLISH *RACK*

1. Old French *reechier*

Antoine Thomas¹ first pointed to the existence in Old French of a verb *reechier* in the sense of 'tirer au clair, soutirer,' relating to the process of refining wine. Starting from the forms *reechié*, *reequie*, *reec* for which Godefroy cites texts but gives no definition, Thomas accumulated an additional documentation from medieval texts. At the end of his article, he says: "Il ne reste plus qu'à

cal? and Physiological, &c. by Alexander Monro, Junior, M. D. Professor of Anatomy, etc., Edinburgh, August, M, DCC, LVIII" (London, 1758; dated October 10, 1758, at the end).

¹⁰ *An Ode to the late Thomas Edwards, Esq; Written in the Year M.DCC.LI.* By Dr. Akenside (London, 1766).

² *Romania* XXXIX (1910), 248-249.

trouver l'étymologie." No one since Thomas, as far as I know, has seriously examined this etymological problem.

Here is a summary of the forms related to *reechier* which are listed by Thomas, to whose article we refer for the sources and texts:

1. Past participles and participial adjectives: *reechié* (13 c.), *reeque* (13 c., fem. sing. *de la tonne reequie*), *reequiez* (13 c.; acc. masc. pl.), *reché* (13 c.), *resquiez* (1397).

2. Verbs: *reschier* (1350; 1611), *resquier* (1397), *resque* (1397; pr subj. 3rd sing.)

3. Verbal adjectives: *reech* (1190),² *reec* (13 c.).

There are numerous forms of this verbal adjective, uncollected by Thomas, in charts executed in England, which I shall cite later in treating English *rack*.

4. Noun: *reschaison* (n d)

There can be little doubt, it seems to me, that OF. *reechner* has as etymon L. *reaedificare* which would have given with the greatest regularity in Central French *reechier* and in Normanno-Picard *reequier*.³ *Aedificare* itself had a popular development in *argier*, an early eastern dialectal form attested in the *loazim* of Raschi (1040-1105).⁴ We also have a popular representative of L. *aedificare* in Port. *eivigar*.

A few other *-ificare* verbs came down into O. F. through popular channels:⁵ *significare* > *senechier*, *senegier*; ⁶ **panificare* > *painne-*

² A second example *vms reechs*, not recorded by Thomas, in a chart of the Abbaye de St. Amand from the middle of the 13 c.; cf. Ch de Beaurepaire, *De la Vicomté de l'Eau de Rouen et de ses coutumes au XIII^e et au XIV^e siècle*, Paris-Rouen, 1866, p. 22. According to Beaurepaire the expression *vin reech* is still in use in the Norman patois.

³ The VL form corresponding to *reaedificare* probably elided the *e* of *re*: *redef*. . . . The *e* of *re* is always found elided before a vowel in OF of the older period; cf. M. Meineke, *Das Präfix re- im Französischen*, Weimar, 1904, p. 6.

⁴ Cf. Romania, I, 164, 166, 169; v, 149, n. 3; xxxv, 622. The forms in Raschi are *aïgea*, *aïgeré* as transcribed. Schuchardt, ZRP., xxx, 436, explains the phonological development of *-ificare*. A form *aeret*, glossed as *aedificaverunt*, is found in a Hebrew-French glossary (13 c) in the Bodleian; cf. Rom. St. I, 168, no. 129.

⁵ Verbs with suffix *-ificare* took on a considerable extension in Late Latin and Cooper considered the formation to be popular, since such verbs are only sparingly represented in C L.; cf. F. T. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeus*, New York, 1895, 316 f. Meyer-Lübke

chier, *pennequier*, *penegier*.⁷ The Hebrew glosses, which give us in transcription examples of French in use by the Jews of the Middle Ages, note the survival of a number of *-ificare* verbs. In addition to *agier* (*aedificare*), Raschi has forms of *frotigier* (*fructificare*).⁸ A Hebrew-French glossary of the 13 c. contains forms of *avijer* (*advivificare*), *abonijer*, *bonijer* (**bonificare* for *benificare*), *seyntijer* (*sanctificare*), *turijer*, *torijer* (*turificare*).⁹ The forms in *-echier* are Central French; those in *-equier* are Normanno-Picard; those in *-egier*, *-ijer* are eastern.¹⁰

Some of the forms noted by Thomas and associated by him with *reechier*, *reequier* call for explanation:

1. *reché* 'transvasé,' in the 13 c. Hebrew-French glossary edited by Lambert and Brandin, shows an early disappearance of unaccented *e* in hiatus. The editors note however that in the document vowels brought together by the fall of a medial consonant are regularly fused by the scribe into one syllable. The presence of *reché* alongside of forms of *bonijer*, *seyntijer*, etc., is due to the fact that the glosses are made up of elements that have neither the same date nor the same local origin.

2. In *reschier* (1350; 1611) the *s* form may be only a graphic variant of *rechier* (= *reechier*) and therefore have no etymological value; cf. *seneschier* alongside of *senechier*. The forms *resquier* (1397), *resquiez* (1397), *resque* (1397), all cited by Godefroy, are found in late 14 c. charts of Tournay. The hiatus had long been

(*Gramm. des langues rom.*, II, § 578) says, however, that verbs in *-ificare* "appartiennent exclusivement à la langue écrite," a statement which is evidently inexact.

⁸ *Romania* XXXVII (1908), 603. Godefroy lists *senechiance*, equivalent of *segnefiance*, without textual reference.

⁷ A. Thomas, *Essais de philologie française*, Paris, 1897, 344.

⁸ Cf. above, note 4

⁹ *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIII^e siècle*, ed. M. Lambert et L. Brandin, Paris, 1905; cf. also *Romania* XXXVI (1907), 445. Blondheim (*Romania* XXXIX (1910), 139) points to O. Sp. *avevignar* and O. Catalan *multigara*, *frutigaras* with corresponding O. Sp. *muchignar*, *fruchignar*. Cf. also Sp. *testignar* (*testificare*), Venetian *onfegar* (**unctificare*; *REW* 9056).

¹⁰ According to Lambert and Brandin, *op. cit.*, the dialect of the scribe of the 13 c. Hebrew-French glosses is a "mélange de formes lorraines, champenoises et bourguigno-comtoises." A. Thomas has noted the survival of forms corresponding to OF. *senegier* (*significare*) in patois of Burgundy, Franche-Comté and Switzerland; cf. *Rom.* XXXVII (1908), 603.

resolved in the dialect of the region. *Resquier* is doubtless of the same category as OF. *resmonter*, *resplenir*, *resposer*, *respoignier*, *restenir*, etc., where such forms as **esmonter*, **esplenir*, **esposer*, etc., have never been attested in OF. They have been influenced by analogy with verbs where real double forms existed: *rebaudir*, *resbaudir*; *recheoir*, *rescheoir*; *regarder*, *resgarder*; *reforcier*, *resforcier*; *rehaitier*, *reshaitier*; *remouvoir*, *resmouvoir*; *retorner*, *restorner*, in which *re-* combines both with simple verb and verb compounded with *es-* (*ex-*). As *es-* often added little or nothing to the sense, *re-* and *res-* became interchangeable.¹¹

3. *Reschaison* (Godefroy): *vin en reschaisons* 'vin reposé, tiré au clair,' found in an undated text of the Orléanaux, represents, according to Thomas, an earlier **reechaison*. We can derive it quite regularly from L. *reaedificationem* (cf. Du Cange under *reaedificamen*).

L. *aedificare* literally 'to erect a building' had a general sense of 'build, raise, erect, build up, establish anything.' A derived abstract sense was 'instruct, edify.' The Late Latin *aedificare* assumed some special concrete meanings based upon what seems to be a general meaning 'improve,' the same idea we have in the abstract in 'instruct, edify.' It came to mean 'cultivate': *aedificare terram*.¹² *Aedificatio* (Du C.) had a meaning 'cultura' and also 'actio terram in pratum redigendi,' or improving the land by its organization into a field. This may be the sense of semi-learned *edefier* in a passage of the 2nd *Moniage Guillaume* (ed. Cloetta, *SATF*), v. 5009:

Vient a ses herbes qu'il ot *edefié*.

A Latin-Germ. glossary¹³ of the 15 c. contains an article: *edificatio* 'nutzbarkeit, besserung.'

The verb *reaedificare* was in use in Late Latin meaning 're-build' (*Vulg., Act.* 15, 16) and probably also 'plant, cultivate,' as semi-learned *redifier* seems to indicate in a passage cited by Godefroy (under *aille*):

planeir et *redifier* bone vigne.

¹¹ Meineke, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

¹² Du Cange *aedificare*. Cicero, *Ep. ad Atticum* 9, 13, uses an expression *aedificare hortos*.

¹³ L. Disfenbach, *Gloss. Lat-Germ. Med. et Inf. Act.* Frankfurt, 1857, 195.

Reaedificatio (Du C. under *reaedificamen*) meant 'reconstruction' and *reaedificamen* signified 'repairing.'

From a general sense 'build up, improve,' discernible in these forms and uses of *aedificare* and *reaedificare*, one can easily see how the latter may have been applied to the process of 'soutirage' or the refining of wine. The prefix *re-*, which may have been a VL. combination with *aedificare*, would represent the step in the transfer of the wine from the lees in one cask into another clean cask. From the semantic point of view *aedificare* and *re-aedificare* might be included in the category of verbs with a general meaning which have had special application in connection with rural occupations:¹⁴ *L. laetificare* (*laetus*) 'gladden, delight,' also 'to spread manure'; *laborer* which in OF. meant 'work,' in Mod. French 'plough'; *traire* (*L. trahere*), originally synonymous with *tirer*, now 'to milk'; *affaitier* in OF. 'prepare' now means in Mod. Fr. (*affaiter*, *afféter*) only 'apprivoiser un oiseau de proie.' Late Latin *aptificare* (*aptus*) 'to make fit' is represented in semi-learned forms in modern patois in various specialized senses: 'cultiver, amender (la terre), faire pousser (des plantes), greffer, élever (des animaux).'¹⁵

In conclusion, then, it appears that *L. aedificare* came down into OF. as a popular word in dialectal *aigier* 'build,' as did also the compound *reaedificare* in *reechier*, *reequier*, 'soutirer, tirer au clair.'

2. English *rack*

English *rack* 'to draw off from the lees' as a process in the refining of wine, is first attested in the form *rakke* in the last half of the 15 c. The word has been in continuous use, both literally and figuratively, ever since, as the series of texts cited by the *NED*. shows. The latter traces English *rack* to Gascon *arraca* of identical meaning. It also refers to the *raqué* of Cotgrave (1611): "Vin raqué, small or course wine, squeezed from the marc or dregs of the grapes, already drayned of their best moisture." The *Century Dictionary* states that the origin is unknown.

Antoine Thomas¹ believes that the rapprochement between *rack* and Gascon *arraca*, whose meanings are identical, is evident, but he is careful not to say that English has done the borrowing. He

¹⁴ Cf. K. Nyrop, *Gramm. Hist.*, iv, 164.

¹⁵ A. Thomas, *Mélanges d'étymologie française*, Paris, 1927, p. 7.

¹ *Rom.* xxxix (1910), 249.

banishes vigorously any connection between *rack* and the *raqué* of Cotgrave since their meanings with reference to wine could not be farther apart.² Thomas also denies any relationship between Gascon *arraca* and Mod. Prov. *raco* 'rafle de raisin, marc,' as put forward by Mistral and the *NED*.³ He does not seek, however, to explain the origin of Gascon *arraca*, nor its connection with Eng. *rack*. Of the latter he says at the end of his article: Je m'avise au dernier moment de l'existence du verbe anglais *to rack* qui a exactement le même sens que les mots que je viens de passer en revue (OF. *reechier*, *reequier*, etc.), c'est à dire celui de 'soutirer.' The English etymologists have not taken account of this observation of Thomas. There can be no doubt that *rack* is the same word as *reechier*, *reequier*.

Anglo-French must have early known *reequier* 'soutirer,' to judge by the adjective and noun forms *reec*, *rec*, etc., which are found as such, or in Latinized dress, in medieval charts, executed in England, that have to do with the wine trade: * *vinis reckis* (1232); L. *dolia vini recca* (1232); *quatuor dolia Wasconiensis recca* (1232); present season of *reek* (1346); *unum dolium vini Was(c)on' de rec* (1228); present season of *reyk* (1333). An Anglo-French chart of 1281 cited by Simon, has both *rec* and *reec* to indicate the season of rack, the spring, when racked wine arrived in England from Gascony. Simon gives in the original a document in Anglo-French of April 2, 1375, in which the rack season is called 'en temps de *reke*,'⁴ There is no doubt that *rec* (*reec*, etc.) had

² Cotgrave (1611) may have gotten his *raqué* from Olivier de Serres, *Theatre d'Agriculture et Mesnage des Champs* (1600). Tels vins pressés ou raqués sont les moins delicats, a cause qu'ils tiennent beaucoup de la substance du marc (Citation from Godefroy based on the ed. of 1605.) Godefroy's definition of *raqué* is: se dit des vins tirés, exprimés du marc de raisin. The passage fully bears out Thomas' objection that the processes of *rack* and *raqué* have nothing in common. To rack wine is to refine it of all suspended matter and to produce a wine of superior quality.

³ Cf. Mid. Fr. *raque*, *raque* 'marc de raisins.' Ernest Weekley (*Etym. Dic.*) may be right in connecting this root (Prov. *raco*) with modern Fr. *drêche* 'residue of malt, grapes, etc.' The *FEW* under **drasca* 'darrmaſ,' to which it relates *drêche*, cites OF. *drasche*, Mid. Fr. *draque* (Picard). It is not impossible that *raque*, *racque* (*raqué*, *raco*) is a variant form of *draque*, identical in meaning; cf. OF. *draoncle*, *raoncle*, *draoncler*, *raoncler*, *rancler* (Eng. *rankle*).

⁴ We cite them from André L. Simon, *The History of the Wine Trade in England*, 1906, vol. I, after verification in the *Rolls*.

⁵ Item, entre Londres, Bordeaux, et La Rochelle en vendage prendra ung

become a trade term in the English wine industry. *Vin de rec* was set off against vintage wine of inferior quality which came to England shortly after the vintage in the fall. The *rec* wines arrived in the spring, were of finer quality, were eagerly sought after, and brought high prices.

We can safely assume that OF. *reequier* came early to England.⁶ Immediately after the Conquest, Norman lords introduced the cultivation of the vine in many places. Normandy was itself at this time a wine producing country. For a time when England began to receive most of its wine from the continent, the port of Rouen had a monopoly on the trade. The process of racking wine was well known in England as ordinances regulating it, attest. We may reasonably infer that Anglo-French **reequier* or **requier*, the normal early contracted form, of which *reec* and *rec* are verbal adjectives, was in use among producers and vintners. A form **raqurier*, variant of **requier* (*reequier*) would be entirely natural.⁷ Middle English seems to have borrowed *rack* from the former, which doubtless represents the popular pronunciation, since forms in *e* have not come down. *Rec* on the other hand was maintained in the official and semi-official charts as a trade name, one current, doubtless, in the French ports.⁸

If what has been said is well founded, it is not difficult to account for Gascon *arraca* which has the same meaning as *rack*. *Reaedificare*, etymon of OF. *reechier*, *reequier* and Eng. *rack*, could not have given phonologically Gascon *arraca*. Thomas (*op. cit.*) cites two early occurrences of the latter verb in the form *arecar* from a

marinier huit souez de loyer et le portaage d'ung tonel et en temps de Reke sept souez de louyer et le portage d'une pipe . . . (*Inquisition taken at Queenborough on April 2, 1375*)

⁶ The English wine trade with the continent has been studied in detail by Simon (*op. cit.*) and there are full accounts of it likewise in Salzman, *English Trade in the Middle Ages*, and E. Lipson, *Economic History of England*. We have taken our facts from these sources, and shall not mention them further.

⁷ Anglo-French had a liking for *a* instead of etymological unstressed *e*; cf. A. Stimming, *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Hautmonte* (*Bibl. Norm.* VII), Halle, 1899, 176.

⁸ English *sack* (French *sec*) would at first seem to represent a phonological development parallel to *rec*, *rack*, but the history of *sack* is obscure. The word first appears in the 16 c. It cannot be traced back to early Anglo-French as in the case of *rec*, *rack*. Murray and Weekley believe that *sec* may have been influenced by *sack* 'bag.'

document of 1412.⁹ Now these Gascon verbs, medieval *arecar*, modern *arraca*, seem to be isolated in Gascony without related representatives elsewhere in medieval or modern Provence or Southern France. Gascony and Languedoc, great wine producing regions, use other words for the process of 'soutirage': *soustira*, *retoumba*, etc. It seems logical to explain Gascon *arecar* and *arraca* as borrowings from Anglo-French **requier* and **raquier*. The initial *ar-* in *arraca* and *arecar* (doubtless a graph for *arrecar*) is the well known reenforcement in Gascon of words beginning with etymological *r*. If the borrowing had been on the side of the English, might we not expect to find a trace of the initial syllable of the Gascon words, which is so characteristic?

The history of the English wine trade with Gascony in the Middle Ages furnishes ample ground for assuming that Gascon *arecar* and *arraca* were borrowed from Anglo-French. Gascony became a possession of England under Henry II and for 300 years English capital and enterprise concentrated upon it. The wine trade with Gascony, especially through Bordeaux, became almost immediately the most important foreign commercial activity in England. Gascon wine merchants teemed in London and often enjoyed special privileges. They frequently filled important official functions, such as wine-testing. On the other hand, English merchants in large number circulated in Gascony to buy and ship wines, especially in the season of *rec*. Anglo-French was the language of commerce. The official regulation of the wine traffic in Gascony was in the hands of Englishmen and English capital sought to extend and improve viticulture and wine production there. It would not be strange therefore if the Gascon dialect should borrow and adopt an Anglo-French trade and technical name that had to do with the racking of wine, especially as the English, who bought almost the entire supply, insisted on the racked wine, as many charts show.

English *rack*, therefore, and Gascon *arraca* (medieval Gascon *arecar*) go back ultimately through Anglo-French to Norman-Picard *reequier* which, with OF. *reechier*, represents the normal popular development of L. *reaedificare*. The process of refining wine by drawing it off of the lees which have been allowed to settle, is so simple that it must be very old.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

⁹ *Comptes des consuls de Montréal-du-Gers*, pub. by Breuils in *Arch. hist. de la Gironde* **XXIX**, 318, art. 33; 323, art. 6.

AN OLD SAXON GHOST-WORD

The NE word *tread* has cognates in most, if not all, of the Germanic dialects, though in varying grades of ablaut. Thus Go. *trudan* and OIcel. *troða*, as opposed to OHG *tretan*, *dretan*, OE *tredan*, OFries. *treda*.

The form *tredan* is frequently cited in grammars and dictionaries as Old Saxon. Diefenbach (1851) in his Gothic etymological dictionary cites OS *tredan* as a cognate of Go. *trudan*. Heyne also quotes an OS *tredan* in his dictionary.¹ Streitberg's Primitive Germanic grammar² gives OS *tredan* on p. 87, omits it on pp. 292 and 298 (where, however, all the other dialect forms are cited) and again omits it in the glossary (p. 363) under "Altsächsisch," though the Gothic, Old English, etc. forms are listed under their respective headings. Kluge³ and Feist⁴ cite an OS *tredan*. Steller in the glossary of his grammar⁵ lists OS *tredan*. Walde-Pokorny⁶ also cite this form. Loewe⁷ and Prokosch⁸ assume such a form for Old Saxon. Sverdrup in his History of the German language⁹ cites 'gs. *tretan*' and 'gammelsaksisk *tretan*' with High German *t* instead of Low German *d*. Wood in his translation¹⁰ of Sverdrup's work changed *tretan* to **tredan* in order to show that such a form is not actually attested in Old Saxon.

Equally as many scholars fail to cite an OS Saxon *tredan* when listing the cognates of *tread*, *treten*, etc. Among these are Grimm, Brugmann, Braune, Hirt, Noreen, and Boer.

¹ *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg (1895) s. v. *treten*.

² *Urgermanische Grammatik*. Heidelberg (1896)

³ *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*¹⁰. Berlin und Leipzig (1924) s. v. *treten*.

⁴ *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*². Halle (1923) s. v. *trudan*.

⁵ *Abriß der altfriesischen Sprache*. Halle (1928), 177.

⁶ *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*². Berlin und Leipzig (1930), I, 796.

⁷ *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*⁴. Berlin und Leipzig (1933), I, 91.

⁸ *Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia (1939), 150.

⁹ *Tysk Sproghistorie*. Oslo (1930), 57 and 204c.

¹⁰ *Brief History of the German language*. Ann Arbor (1937), 58, 195.

The form *tredan* does not occur in the *Heland*, as a glance at Behaghel's edition of the *Heland und Genesis* (1933) or at Sehr's *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum Heland und zur altsächsischen Genesis* will reveal. Holthausen in the first edition of his Old Saxon grammar¹¹ does not list *tredan*. In the second edition, however, he does list OS *tredan* in the vocabulary. If one follows up the reference after the form, he will find in the "Berichtigungen und Nachträge" the following: "vgl. noch **tredan* 'treten' (nach *trāda* 'Tritt' und mnd. *treden*)."¹² In other words he admits that OS *tredan* is a hypothetical form. Yet in his Old English etymological dictionary¹³ he perpetuates the fiction, listing under OE *tredan* an "as. *tredan*." Gallée¹⁴ and Wadstein¹⁵ do not cite an OS *tredan* in their respective glossaries. Heyne, however, in his collection of Old Low German monuments¹⁶ lists such a form in the glossary. Likewise, in his Old Saxon and Old Low Franconian grammar one finds the form *treda* 'treten.' Schade in his Old German dictionary¹⁷ is closer to the correct designation when he cites *tredan* as 'And Ps' (i. e. Altniederdeutsche Psalmen), though this is somewhat ambiguous. Weigand¹⁸ and Franck¹⁹ are right in citing *tredan* as 'andfr.' and 'onfr.' respectively.

The truth of the matter is that *tredan* does not occur anywhere in Old Saxon, but does appear twice in the Old Low Franconian Psalms. Thus the confusion arose from the fact that the Psalms were often called 'altniederdeutsch' and this term was (and still is) frequently considered synonymous with 'altsächsisch,' though actually Old Saxon and Old Low Franconian together combine to form Old Low German. *Tredan* undoubtedly existed in Old Saxon, but since it is not attested in any document in this dialect, the form should, I think, be starred or designated as Old Low Franconian.

JOHN M. ECHOLS

University of Virginia Library

¹¹ *Altsächsisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg (1899).

¹² *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg (1934), 352.

¹³ *Altsächsische Sprachdenkmäler*. Leiden (1894).

¹⁴ *Kleinere altsächsische Sprachdenkmäler*. Norden und Leipzig (1899).

¹⁵ *Kleinere altniederdeutsche Denkmäler*². Paderborn (1877).

¹⁶ *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Halle (1872-82), s. v. *treten*.

¹⁷ *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Giessen (1909-1910), s. v. *treten*.

¹⁸ *Etymologische Woordenboek der nederlandse Taal*². 's Gravenhage (1912) s. v. *treden*.

RUBÉN DARÍO IN NEW YORK

Rubén Darío, the greatest of Spanish-American poets, spent several months in New York City at the end of 1914 and the beginning of 1915. I have tried to conduct an inquiry, within certain limits, into this fragment of the poet's life. What did he do in New York at this time? What did he write, and what was written about him? These are some of the questions that I wanted particularly to answer.

Darío's visit to New York in 1914 was not his first. He had seen the city previously in 1893 and again in 1907. In 1893 he returned to Nicaragua from Madrid, where his government had sent him as a delegate to the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America. The government of Colombia then appointed him its consul in Buenos Aires, and he sailed from Panama with the somewhat extraordinary determination to reach his post by way of New York and Paris.

In New York, in 1893, Darío was entertained by the Cuban colony under the leadership of José Martí, whose oratorical and conversational powers he greatly admired, and after whose death he wrote a panegyric which appears as an introduction to the fourth volume of Martí's *Obras completas*.¹ Martí introduced him to Charles A. Dana, editor of *The New York Sun*. When Dana died, Darío wrote a laudatory article now to be found in his *Prosa dispersa*.² During his first visit to the United States the poet undertook an excursion to Niagara Falls, where he recalled Herédia's verses on the mighty cataract, but was disappointed in what he saw. All these things are described at some length in his *Autobiografía*.³ It was at this time that he wrote, in the album of a Cuban lady, his pleasing and unusual poem *El país del sol*, published later in *Prosas profanas*.⁴ And Francisco Contreras, his biographer and critic, says: "*Stella*, which our author included in his article on Poe, in *Los Raros*, must have been written in 1893, when he passed through New York on his way to Paris."⁵ This seems hardly likely,

¹ Martí, José Julián, *Obras completas*, Habana, 1905, iv, (9) 24.

² Darío, Rubén, *Obras completas*, ed. "Mundo Latino," Madrid, 1917-20, xx, 81-5.

³ *Ibid.*, xv, 107-11.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii, 73.

⁵ Contreras, Francisco, *Rubén Darío, su vida y su obra*, Paris, 1930, p. 276.

however, for Darío himself declares, in the prologue to *Los Raros*, that except for his essays on Maclair and Adam the entire book was written in Buenos Aires.⁶

Fourteen years later, in 1907, he tarried in New York again on his way home from Paris, where he had been serving as Nicaraguan consul-general. In his small but highly informative book, *El viaje a Nicaragua*, he says of this brief sojourn: "I passed through the Yankee metropolis when it was at the height of a financial crisis. I felt the hurricane that blew through the Stock Exchange. I admired the omnipotence of the multi-millionaire and observed the money-madness of the vast city of gold."⁷

Darío's last visit to New York occurred in 1914. Alejandro Bermúdez, a Nicaraguan journalist, persuaded him to leave Barcelona, where he had been trying to recover his broken health, and to undertake with him a lecture tour in the United States, Mexico, and Central America. The pair reached New York late in November. It was cold, and Darío was stunned by the ceaseless turmoil of the great metropolis. His arrival was heralded by an article which appeared in *The New York Times* for November 29, 1914, and which is headed: NOTED SOUTH AMERICAN POET WRITES ABOUT NEW YORK. RUBÉN DARÍO OF NICARAGUA, CELEBRATED THROUGHOUT SPANISH-SPEAKING WORLD, DESCRIBES FOR THE TIMES HIS EMOTIONS ON ARRIVING HERE. *The Times* goes on to say:

Little known in this country, Rubén Darío is considered by many the prince of all living poets writing in the Spanish language. Born in the little Central American republic of Nicaragua, the voice of Darío, like that of Kipling in far-away India, was soon heard throughout the Spanish-speaking world. . . . Señor Darío is now in this country on a lecture-tour in the interests of international peace. . . . Below is a sketch of Señor Darío's impressions on first seeing New York, dashed off by the great Spanish-American poet especially for *The New York Times* after his arrival here a few days ago from Europe.

The above editorial introduction is followed by the impressions of Darío himself. They begin with a sketch of New York Harbor and an apostrophe to the Statue of Liberty. Then comes a really interesting description of some of the poet's fellow-passengers whom he takes for genuine North American types. The conclusion of the article says:

⁶ Darío, *Obras completas*, VI, (7).

⁷ *Ibid.*, XVII, 2. Translation by the author.

Like the knights of old in their castles, the men of Manhattan live to-day in their towers of stone, iron, and glass. . . At the sight of Broadway you feel the touch of vertigo . . . Everywhere the mad life of an ant-hill reigns, an ant-hill of gigantic dray-horses, monstrous wagons, all sorts of vehicles. . . . Look! From the very heart of the human maelstrom emerges an old lady, or a blonde miss, or a nurse carrying a baby in her arms. And lo! a fat policeman raises his hand, the torrent is dammed, the lady trips across the street

The odd and amusing thing about this article, which "Señor Darío dashed off especially for *The New York Times*" on November 29, 1914, is that it is translated verbatim from the initial paragraphs of his essay on Edgar Allan Poe, in *Los Raros*, which was written in Buenos Aires twenty-one years previously, in 1893!⁸ It may be that *The Times* asked Darío for a "story" and that he, as a kind of prank, copied out a part of the twenty-one-year-old essay and submitted it. On the other hand it may be that the newspaper, without consulting him at all, decided to save time or money by offering its readers a stale article instead of a fresh one. What actually happened will probably remain a mystery forever.

A composition that Darío almost certainly wrote at this time is his poem *La gran Cosmópolis*, which appears on pages 35 ff. of the collection *Lira póstuma*.⁹ It is a description of the city of New York, written, according to Francisco Contreras, on the occasion with which we are concerned.¹⁰ I quote the first stanza of this poem:

Casas de cincuenta pisos,
Servidumbre de color,
Millones de circuncisos,
Máquinas, diarios, avisos,
Y dolor, dolor, dolor.

Señor Roberto Brenes-Mesén, former minister from Costa Rica to the United States and for many years professor of Spanish at Northwestern University, has written me the following account of his impressions on meeting Rubén Darío in New York in 1914:

I was living in Washington, and one afternoon of the late fall I received from New York a telegram signed by Rubén Darío, with friendly greetings and advising me of his desire to see me soon. I answered that three days later I would meet him in New York. And so I did. Shortly after having

⁸ *Ibid.*, vi, 17-20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, xxi. This poem appears also in *Sol del domingo*, pp. (39) 43.

¹⁰ Contreras, *op. cit.*, p. (129).

registered at the Hotel Astor I tried unsuccessfully to reach him by telephone. Across the street, in front of the Astor, there was a theatre, the Vitagraph, that aroused my curiosity. I decided to go in, and when about to take my seat, lo, my neighbor to the right was Rubén Darío, and next to him was the orator Bermúdez, who had come with the poet to undertake a series of lectures. We stayed there a while, and then we went out to take a walk on Broadway and have freedom to talk. We agreed to meet to have lunch the next day at Angelo's, at that time well known for the Spanish food they served. I invited them to have wine—there was no Prohibition—and Rubén Darío refused. Rubén was elated. When he had left Europe they were proposing an edition of his complete works, and he was delighted with the type, the format, and the titles of some of the volumes, particularly one that had seized upon his fancy—*Y muy siglo dieciocho y muy moderno*. His hopes were high. He had come to the United States on a lecture-tour which impressed me as having two different aims: one, artistic, to make better known his poetry, with readings of his own; the other, to be accomplished by his companion, Mr. Bermúdez, was to campaign in favor of the Allies. I may have misunderstood, but that was my impression. This time Rubén Darío was effusive; he had enthusiasm and faith in the results of his tour as well as in the success of that new edition of his complete works. I sensed in him a felicitous blending of maturity and youth which belied the sagging of his face and the growing rotundity of his figure. His hands had not aged; his slow gait alone betrayed fatigue. He had become more sociable, more expansive; mellowness haloed his life, a true embodiment of his exquisite *Otoño en Primavera*.

Unfortunately the poet had come to New York with an insufficient supply of money. Mr. Archer M. Huntington, President of the Hispanic Society of America, generously offered to help him, but Darío would accept only five hundred dollars. Wishing to earn his own living, as he had done all his life, he began to write articles for New York's leading Spanish newspaper, *La Prensa*.¹¹

At Columbia University on February 4, 1915, Darío read a long poem entitled *Pax*. A part of this poem was later included in *Lira póstuma* and in *Hipsipilas*.¹² All of it is to be found in *Baladas y canciones*.¹³ *Pax* is a typical made-to-measure poem, lifeless and over-burdened with pedantic allusions. It has several good stanzas, however, and the final stanza is interesting because it pleads for union among the republics of North and South America.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Darío, *op. cit.*, XXI, 1-4. *Hipsipilas*, ed. Dr. Regino E. Boti. Guantánamo (Cuba), 1920.

¹³ Darío, Rubén, *Obras poéticas completas*, ed. M. Aguilar, Madrid, 1932, pp. 1241-8.

Paz a la inmensa América. Paz en nombre de Dios.
 Y pues aquí está el foco de una cultura nueva,
 'que sus principios lleve desde el Norte hasta el Sur,
 hagamos la Unión viva que el nuevo triunfo lleva;
The Star Splanged (sic) Banner, con el blanco y azur.

The subject of the short but stirring poem *Los cañones del Marne* would indicate that it belongs to this same period. Contreras places it here,¹⁴ and Dr. Regino E. Boti, the collector of Darío's unpublished and unfamiliar verses, dates it 1915.¹⁵ It is contained in *Baladas y canciones*.¹⁶ The poet had seen French cannons rolling towards the front bedecked with flowers. Was this not ridiculous? Not at all, for in a few short days these glorious cannons were to return victorious from the Battle of the Marne.

Os vi pasar un día con rumbo a la frontera!
 'oh, cañones de Francia! galanos y marciales;
 donde los entusiastas nimbaban vuestra fiera
 garganta, coronada por manos virginales.
 Vosotros, los guardianes de paso perentorio,
 férreos predicadores de cláusulas rugientes,
 pasabais, como aldeanos que acuden al jolgorio,
 con la rosa o la dalia cogida entre los dientes.
 ¿Pues cómo tolerabais aquel arnés de flores?
 ¿No era absurdo, felinos de rígidas espaldas,
 que en tanto que avanzaban los toscos invasores,
 marchaseis a su encuentro ceñidos de guirnaldas?
 'Oh, no, que en breves días, sus épicos racimos
 os brindó la victoria, y entonces ¡Oh! cañones;
 todos, en un arranque de júbilo, sentimos
 renacer vuestras rosas en nuestros corazones!

Subsequent to his reading of *Paz*, Darío was awarded a medal and made an honorary member of the Hispanic Society. His companion Bermúdez, who had lectured on the same theme, disappeared shortly afterwards. Alone and financially distressed, Darío was stricken with double pneumonia. He was taken to the French Hospital, where he ultimately recovered. Before he had regained his strength he left the hospital and installed himself in a cheap

¹⁴ Contreras, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

¹⁵ Boti, Dr. Regino E., "Versos inéditos y desconocidos de Rubén Darío," *Cuba contemporánea*, 31 (March, 1923), pp. 260-83.

¹⁶ Darío, *op. cit.*, p. 1234.

boarding-house on 64th Street.¹⁷ Dr. Boti quotes Fernando Portuondo as having said, with regard to these dark days: "I met by chance, in Havana, the nurse who had attended the poet . . . during his last sojourn in New York. . . . The nurse, a woman of charm and cultivation . . ., possessed an album containing numerous verses unknown to the public, with which Rubén rewarded, in imperishable coin, her compassionate ministrations."¹⁸ However I can find no evidence that these verses have ever been published, either by Portuondo or by anyone else.

The physician who attended Darío in his illness was Dr. Aníbal Zelaya, nephew of a former president of Nicaragua. Dr. Zelaya is now president of the Comité Rubén Darío of the Liga Internacional de Acción Bolivariana. Before this body, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of Darío's death, he read a paper which he has kindly placed at my disposal and from which I quote the following anecdote:

On his way home to Nicaragua Rubén visited New York for the last time. He was already very ill, and yearned more ardently every day for his beloved homeland. Among the many invitations he received I remember that of Dr. Frank Crane, the popular American philosopher now deceased, who asked him to come to a regally appointed club. He and his friends arrived, as was our invariable custom, an hour late. Dr Crane confined himself to welcoming us and performing the introductions, after which he left at once, since he had to be present at some public function. Before leaving he generously ordered that we should be given whatever we desired. Someone in our group then said: "In that case, friends, let's drink champagne!" But Rubén Darío, who had overheard this remark, replied with a lordly gesture: "No, gentlemen, we shall drink nothing. A courteous act must be met with an act more courteous still."

Darío wrote a prose poem entitled *Sol del domingo* which was published in 1917 in a volume of the same name.¹⁹ It deals with a small boy who is awakened by the church bells on Easter Sunday, and it begins as follows: "Sol del domingo . . ., Rásgase como un largo velo de tiempo y he aquí que se oye un cántico de campanarios; sois vosotros, campanas de Pascua Florida, campanas de la niñez." The subject matter of *Sol del domingo* suggests that it was written

¹⁷ Contreras, *op. cit.*, p. 130. One or two writers have affirmed that Darío lived on "Store St." There is no such street in New York, but there are a Stone St. and a Storey Ave. Neither is anywhere near 64th St.

¹⁸ Boti, Dr. Regino E., *Hermas viales*, Guantánamo (Cuba), 1924, p. 10.

¹⁹ *Sol del domingo; poesías inéditas de Rubén Darío*, Madrid, Sucesores de Hernando, 1917, pp. (35)-7.

at Easter tide in 1915, though one source of information places it in December.²⁰

In the early spring of 1915 the President of Guatemala, thinking perhaps of his own interests as well as of Darío's, invited the poet to visit him. Although Darío disliked his prospective host most cordially, he could not afford to refuse the invitation. It was just before his departure, with scarcely any doubt, that he wrote the poem *Soneto Pascual*, which was first published in *Revista de Revistas*, Mexico, August 7, 1921, and which now appears in *Baladas y canciones*.²¹ Boti dates the sonnet 1915, and reproduces part of a newspaper clipping which states that Darío wrote it in his hotel during Holy Week, just before his departure for Guatemala.²² *Soneto Pascual* describes the flight of the Holy Family, and ends with two sad lines in which the poet declares that he too has abandoned Bethlehem and is bound for Egypt on his poor donkey, but without any morning star to guide him. This is probably the last poem written by Darío before he left for Central America, where he was to die the following year.

María estaba pálida y José, el carpintero;
miraban en los ojos de la Faz pura y bella
el celeste milagro que anunciaba la estrella
do ya estaba el martirio que aguardaba al cordero.

Los pastores cantaban. Despacioso, postrero,
iba un carro de arcángeles que dejaban su huella.
Apenas se miraba lo que Aldebarán sella,
y el lucero del alba no era aún tempranero.

Esa visión en mí se alza y se multiplica
en detalles preciosa y en mil prodigios rica,
por la cierta esperanza del mas Divino Bien

De la Virgen y el Niño y el San José proscrito,
y yo, en mi pobre burro, caminando hacia Egipto,
y sin la estrella ahora, muy lejos de Belén.

Those who knew Rubén Darío during the few months that he spent in New York in 1914 and 1915 say that his condition at

²⁰ "Un soneto inédito de Rubén Darío," *Cultura Venezolana*, xli (February-March, 1930), 317, 18. This article is reprinted from *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires, but the date of its original publication is not given. It is the same as Boti's clipping mentioned above, except that it is complete.

²¹ Darío, *op. cit.*, p. 1198.

²² Boti, "Versos inéditos y desconocidos de Rubén Darío."

that time was not conducive to writing either prose or verse. He was afflicted by financial worries, by the departure of his trusted companion, by physical suffering, and by nostalgia. Therefore it is not surprising if only five compositions can be definitely ascribed to this brief period in his life. I refer to *La gran Cosmópolis*, *Pax*, *Los Cañones del Marne*, *Sol del domingo*, and *Soneto Pascual*. It may be that additional material will be turned up in the near future.

ELIOT G. FAY

The Citadel, Charleston

HUGO'S *BANCROFT* AND *LE MESSAGE DE GRANT*

Americans reading *L'Année terrible*, the volume of patriotic and singularly up-to-date poems which Hugo wrote in 1871 during the Prussian investment of Paris, are a little startled to come upon two bitter compositions breathing hatred and contempt for a pair of the most prominent American statesmen of the day. The first, entitled simply "Bancroft," annihilates the historian George Bancroft with all the deference accorded to an insect, while the second, a lengthier and less effective piece called "Le Message de Grant," denounces President Grant and exhorts the American people to reject him as a symbol of their democracy. Even contemporaries of these highly honored American citizens were slightly bewildered by Hugo's attacks when they first appeared.

"Oddly enough," wrote Charles A. Bristed, reviewing *L'Année terrible* for the *Nation*, "we come in for a large share of the abuse, considering our very small share in the action. Bancroft is like the obscene bird which defiles the head of the Colossus in the desert. Perhaps he deserved that for doing or saying something in Berlin. But Grant—we rather expected to hear him praised as the first potentate who acknowledged the new republic. It seems, however, that he has spit upon France and stabbed her and thrown mud on his own flag. How? Where? When? We suspect the poet himself would be puzzled to tell us."¹

Undoubtedly Hugo could have cleared up the matter to Bristed's satisfaction, but, since he never made any public explanation of his curious poems, a full review of the facts, which have never been all brought together, is in order.

¹ *Nation*, xiv, 393 (June 13, 1872).

At the time of the Franco-Prussian War, George Bancroft, seventy years old and world famous as the author of the definitive nine-volume *History of the United States*, was serving as American ambassador to Germany. He was fond of the country, at whose University of Göttingen he had studied as a young man and received his degree of doctor of philosophy, like Edward Everett before him. It happened that September, 1870, was the jubilee year of Bancroft's doctorate from the University of Göttingen and that during the celebration he received many congratulatory messages, among them a telegram from Bismarck dated Sept. 20 from Meaux. In acknowledgment Bancroft sent Bismarck a letter in which he wished him good fortune in his task of "renovating Europe" and bringing "the German hope of a thousand years to its fulfillment."

Bismarck, who probably realized its value as propaganda, at once published the letter, which was in German, and a translation was printed forthwith in the London *Times*, whence it made its way across the Channel into France.

The French, counting upon American sympathy during this hour of their distress, were sorely dismayed. Hugo was incensed. In the review of *L'Année terrible* which he wrote for *l'Indépendance belge*, Jules Claretie tells of a visit made about this time to the poet's temporary apartment in the pavillon de Rohan by an American diplomat named John O'Sullivan.² O'Sullivan, American minister to Portugal under President Pierce and a French sympathizer, was quitting beleaguered Paris and came to pay his respects to Hugo before leaving. The two men chatted for a while, when suddenly Hugo asked if the American government was not going to recall Bancroft. O'Sullivan, a staunch Democrat who had less than no use for the politics or the person of President Grant, explained that in his country an envoy's private opinions in no way bound the nation, and added that Grant was a very common person whose chief claim to importance was his slaughter of hundreds of thousands of his fellowmen, who knew nothing about literature unless it dealt with horses, and who instinctively revered Bancroft's

*John L. O'Sullivan (1813-1895) was born at Gibraltar on a British man-of-war, the son of an American sea captain who served as consul on the island of Teneriffe. Educated in France, England, and Columbia College, he practiced law at New York before founding the *United States Democratic Review*. He was a close friend of Hawthorne and an ardent nationalist in public affairs.

intelligence too much ever to recall him. Hugo struck the table and declared that just as he loved his mother most of all women, so of all nations he loved France,³ even though his political ideal was a unified Europe:

Et je proteste, lorsque je vois un Bancroft . . . ce Bancroft que j'attacherai à un pilori . . . venir donner à la France agonisante le coup de pied du rustre. Notre gloire, voyez-vous, Monsieur O'Sullivan, c'est que nous vous avons tout donné et que nous ne vous demandons rien. Votre honte, c'est que nous vous avons tout donné et que vous ne nous rendez rien.⁴

The conversation then turned to the food situation, and Hugo, joking about the hardships he was sharing with the rest of the population, repeated a rhyme he had improvised at breakfast:

Manger du cheval ou du chien,
Ou du rat, cela me repose;
Quand on l'ignore, ce n'est rien;
Quand on l'apprend, c'est peu de chose!

But Hugo never forgot his promise, and it is likely that some of the lines of "Bancroft," which according to the author's manuscript was written in January, 1871, were already revolving about the poet's brain on that dark October day in 1870.

At this time Hugo had no quarrel with either the American government or its president. As a matter of fact they were on the best of terms. The United States had been the first foreign power to recognize the newly created Government of National Defense, proclaimed by Gambetta on Sept. 5, and a demonstration of gratitude took place before the American embassy the following day. Hugo's own paper, *Le Rappel*, in an editorial, thanked President Grant for his courageous initiative and kind wishes.

But events quickly soured these cordial relations. France's military position grew more and more untenable, until about November the government secretly requested the United States to use its good offices to obtain a peace. The American government declined, and in his message to the Forty-first Congress on Dec. 5, 1870, President Grant explained that not only was Germany

³ Cf. the ending of the poem "Choix entre les deux nations"

⁴ These sentiments are repeated in "Le Message de Grant":

—La France secourut l'Amérique, et tira
L'épée, et prodigua tout pour sa délivrance.
Et, peuples, l'Amérique a poignardé la France!

unofficially known to be indisposed to listen to peace offers, but it was also against the policy of the United States to intervene in European affairs. These were the only two statements in the message that could be construed as disobliging the French government, but in France they were magnified by the press into expressions of hostility. This feeling was not relieved by the half-hearted congratulations which Grant sent as a matter of form and courtesy to Kaiser Wilhelm, newly crowned at Versailles on Jan. 18, 1871. In France, by some distortion of the news, Grant was accused of felicitating the Prussians every time they scored a victory at the expense of the French. Victor Hugo suddenly lost his faith in the American people and his friendship for Grant. It is possible also that O'Sullivan's biased characterization of Grant came back to color his own picture of him in "Le Message de Grant," for Hugo has never been noted for preoccupation with historical accuracy.

O nation suprême,
Tu sais de quel cœur tendre et filial je t'aime,

cried out the anguished poet; and he went on to beg it not to let the evil actions of its president blacken the land of Penn, Fulton, Franklin, Jefferson, Jackson, Adams, Lincoln, and John Brown, among others. Hugo refused to see Grant when the latter made his triumphal world tour in 1877. His fancied grievance against him was shared by the writers of the articles on Grant in the *Dictionnaire de la conversation*, the *Grand Dictionnaire Larousse*, and Vapereau's *Dictionnaire des contemporains*. When Grant died in 1885, his French obituaries all carried references to his supposed hostility toward France. An American journalist in France, Theodore Stanton, wrote a pamphlet in 1889 called *General Grant and the French*⁵ in which he undertook to show the groundlessness of the charges against Grant. His arguments are irrefutable, but it is certain they had not a fraction of the effect of Hugo's verses on French opinion.⁶

⁵ Only three copies of the pamphlet are known to exist, one in the Library of Congress, another in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and a third in the *Cornell Magazine* (Oct. 1889), where it first appeared. Stanton (1851-1925), Paris agent of several American publishing houses, was a graduate of Cornell University.

⁶ Hugo lashed out against Bancroft and Grant in a third poem, "A la France," even better than the other two, and this time also reproached the

Years passed, and with them both the crisis and the rupture. Hugo's peace with the American people was symbolized by the visit he paid on Nov. 29, 1884, to the studio of the sculptor Bartholdi, where the Statue of Liberty was being prepared for shipment to New York. The eighty-two year old poet had to be dissuaded from climbing the ten flights of stairs inside it. He contemplated the statue a moment, then said:

La mer, cette grande agitée, constate l'union des deux grandes terres apaisées!

Oui, cette belle œuvre tend à ce que j'ai toujours aimé, appelé: la Paix. Entre l'Amérique et la France—la France qui est l'Europe—ce gage de paix demeurera permanent. Il était bon que cela fût fait.⁷

ALBERT L. RABINOVITZ

Cambridge, Mass.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER FROM JEAN-BAPTISTE ROUSSEAU TO D'ARGENTAL

This letter from Jean-Baptiste Rousseau to d'Argental appears to be the only first-hand evidence of an acquaintance between the two men. Most of Rousseau's other known letters have been published in Louis Racine's *Lettres sur différents sujets de littérature* (Genève 1749-50, 5 vols.), in the Lefèvre edition of the *Œuvres de J.-B.*

American people for having abandoned and abused France in her hour of affliction. Possibly here Hugo's rebuke had some basis in fact, for more than a few prominent Americans shared Bancroft's partiality for the Germans. Algernon Swinburne, in his review of *L'Année terrible* (*Fortnightly Review*, XVIII, 245, Sept. 1, 1872) wrote of "renegade friends who had no word of comfort and no hand for help in the hour of the passion of France crucified, but were seen with hands outstretched from over sea

'Shaking the bloody fingers of her foes'

in the presence (as they thought it) of her corpse" From the company of these "meaner American persons" he specifically excluded Walt Whitman, "the greatest of American voices, . . . the first poet of American democracy," who had, as he pointed out, recognized the greatness of France and of Hugo, the former in "O Star of France, 1870-1871," *Leaves of Grass*, the latter in his book of essays entitled *Democratic Vistas*.

⁷ The full account of the visit is given in Jules Claretie, *Victor Hugo, Souvenirs intimes*, pp. 163-167, Paris, 1902, Librairie Molière.

Rousseau (Paris 1820, 5 vols.), and in the *Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette* (Paris 1910, 2 vols.). I am publishing the following letter from the original three-page octavo manuscript which I purchased from a Paris book-seller in May of 1940. Since then I have been unable to discover anything of its previous history.

This letter was written in 1721 from Vienna, where Rousseau had found the protection of Prince Eugene. When Rousseau had been banished in perpetuity from France in 1712 "il trouva une première et généreuse hospitalité" with the Comte du Luc at Solothurn in Switzerland. In 1714 the Comte du Luc was named Ambassador to Vienna, where Rousseau followed him and where he soon came to the attention of Prince Eugene. Although the Comte du Luc returned to Paris in 1717, Rousseau did not leave Vienna until 1722.

At the time when he wrote this letter to d'Argental, Rousseau was still waiting—after some three years—for a post promised him by Prince Eugene, and was enjoying some popularity in the world of letters, for in 1719 Voltaire had sent him a copy of *Œdipe* to ask for criticism and advice. But in general Rousseau's literary activity seems to have dwindled almost to nothing beyond a small amount of correspondence in the same tone as the following letter:

Address:

A Monsieur,
Monsieur d'Argental.
A Paris.

A Vienne le 11 Fevrier 1721.

Je vois avec bien de la joie Monsieur par les sentimens que vous me faites l'honneur de me marquer, que le déport de la Vertu se conserve encore en France au milieu de la corruption generale¹ Je sais jusqu'a quel excez elle y est montée² mais je n'aurois jamais sù si vous ne m'en assuriez qu'on eut

¹ In a letter of October, 1720, Rousseau speaks in more definite terms of the general corruption: "la contagion dont les esprits sont infectés dans la capitale n'est pas moins digne d'horreur que celle qui désole Marseille est digne de compassion" The "contagion qui désole Marseille" evidently refers to the plague of 1720-21 which was then less than half a league from the home of Rousseau's former protector, the Comte du Luc. France had also just witnessed the collapse of the Law system. In a letter of January 10, 1721, Rousseau deplores this "si incroyable révolution de toutes les fortunes."

² The libels being circulated at this time against the Regent had affected Rousseau profoundly, and it is probably these scandalous writings to which

pû la porter jusqu'au point d'attacher du ridicule au sentiment qui est le principal et peut être l'unique lien des Societez. On peut dire que ceux qui soutiennent un si étrange paradoxe font violence à la nature pour se rendre odieux et méprisables à tout le Genre humain. Vous ferez fort bien de ne les point aimer Monsieur puisqu'ils font profession de n'aimer personne.³ Pour moi qui vous aimerai toute ma vie je ne prétends de voir qu'en mes sentiments la confirmation de ceux dont vous m'honorez. Recevez une fois pour toutes cette déclaration d'amitié toute sommaire qu'elle est. Je suis un homme du vieux tems, et les nouveaux systèmes n'ont pas assez bien réussi en France pour me dégouter des anciens. Aussi me fais-je excuser tout ce que ma morale antique ne vous accomode mieux que la morale moderne.

Je vois par ce que Madame votre mere ⁴ m'a fait l'honneur de m'écrire que vous êtes sur le point d'être reçu Conseiller au Parlement.⁵ C'est de toutes les professions celle où il est le plus dangereux de se méprendre dans la recherche de la vérité, et il est bien difficile de surmonter toutes les difficultés qui en retardent la connaissance, si on n'est pas épris pour elle d'un véritable amour. C'est le plus digne usage qu'un homme raisonnable puisse faire de sentiment. Je vous conjure de vouloir bien continuer de faire quelque fois ma cour à Madame de Beaune ⁶ et d'être toujours persuadé que rien n'égale le tendre attachement et la vraie considération avec laquelle j'ai l'honneur d'être Monsieur Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

ROUSSEAU

he is referring here. In a letter of October 28, 1720, Rousseau writes to Brossette: "J'ai vu et lu tout le long de ces ouvrages monstueux [*Les Philippiques* de La Grange] . . . et j'avoue que s'ils étaient faits contre le plus vil particulier du royaume, encore mériteraient-ils un châtimement exemplaire"

³ Rousseau might well express himself thus, for even at this time he was still being attacked. In the letter of October 28, 1720, Rousseau says to Brossette: "Au reste j'ai su . . . que dans le débordement de tous ces infâmes vers satiriques qui courent le monde, mes ennemis ne m'ont point oublié. Ce serait bien pis si j'étais assez malheureux pour vivre dans un pays aussi livré à la calomnie que la France l'est aujourd'hui."

⁴ Mme de Férriol, wife of the President of the Parlement de Metz. She had formerly befriended Rousseau, had hidden him from her husband, and had given him a letter of recommendation when he first went to Solothurn. In his *Vie de Rousseau* Voltaire says that when Rousseau fled from France "Mme de Férriol, distinguée dans le monde pour son esprit, le retira chez elle pendant quelques jours." It was probably during this visit that Rousseau made the acquaintance of the young d'Argental.

⁵ At the time when the letter was written, d'Argental was indeed "sur le point d'être reçu" for the date of his reception follows by only ten days that of Rousseau's letter.

⁶ Mme de Beaune is probably the same as the Mme de Bouzols who figures in Voltaire's *Vie de Rousseau*, for her husband, the Marquis de Bouzols,

This hitherto unpublished letter seems to be a typical Rousseau document. It expresses those ideas with which he had been pre-occupied since the Affair of the Couplets and his subsequent banishment. He deplores national and personal misfortunes and he thinks of happier times. This letter likewise shows that Rousseau was not only acquainted with d'Argental, Conseiller au Parlement, but that the once honored poet was perhaps trying to cement a connection powerful and influential enough to result in an eventful revocation of the decree which banished him in perpetuity from France.

ARTHUR J. WHALLON, JR.

Indiana University

THE SUMMONER'S "PSALM OF DAVIT"

Friar John of *The Summoner's Tale* in his sermon at Mass, and later in his discourse at the home of the bedridden Thomas, compares the prayers of the mendicant orders with those of rival clerics "that swymmen in possessioun." Efficacious prayer, he says, must come from the lips of pure and sober ministers, and such are his brethren. They live in poverty and abstinence, in contrast to the possessioners, with their pomp and gluttony. Of these he says:

Methynketh they been lyk Jovinian,
Fat as a whale and walkynge as a swan,
Al vinolent as botel in the spence.
Hir preyere is of ful greet reverence,
Whan they for soules seye the psalm of Davit;
Lo, 'but,' they seye, 'cor meum eructavit!'¹

The reading of this last line, which appears in all modern editions, is warranted by several manuscripts; but others, including the usually accurate Ellesmere,² read *but* instead of *but* in the expression 'Lo, 'but,' they seye.' Commentators have not been

was also Vicomte de Beaune. She, like her friend, Mme de Fériel, had given Rousseau a letter of recommendation when he left for Solothurn.

¹ *The Summoner's Tale*, 1929-34. With Chaucer's expression "psalm of Davit" cf. Villon's designation of the seven penitential psalms as "les davitiques dis" (*Testament* 291).

² See Manly and Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, 6. 200; *The Six-Text Print* of the Chaucer Society, 1st Series, No. 25, Part 4, p. 391; and Skeat, *Notes to the Canterbury Tales*, pp. 355-36.

concerned with the appropriateness of Psalm 44, which begins *Eructavit cor meum*, as a prayer for the dead. They seem to have assumed that the whole point of the joke lies in the pun on *eructavit*, uttered by an ecclesiastic in his cups. If that were the case, the reading of the Ellesmere and other texts (Lo, but they seye, "*Cor meum eructavit*") would indeed be meaningless, whereas the substitution of *buf* for *but* not only makes the line intelligible, but enforces the double meaning of *eructavit*.

A preoccupation with this play on words has caused modern interpreters to overlook the grain in favor of the chaff. For centuries that epithalamion, the *Eructavit cor meum*,³ has been regarded by the Church as a song of jubilation for the triumphant Elect. Extolling the Messiah as Bridegroom, it describes the splendor of his marriage and the beauty of his Bride the Church, in her many-colored garments.⁴ Surely no sober ecclesiastic ever used it as a prayer for the dead; to do so would be like striking up the Mendelssohn Wedding March when the occasion demanded the Dead March from *Saul*. Only the seven penitential psalms would be used as liturgical prayers for souls in purgatory, and more especially Psalm 129, the *De profundis*. Catholic usage has appropriated it as "the peculiar prayer for the dead,"⁵ since it, more accurately than the other penitential psalms, describes the state of those souls in whose behalf the Church recites it.⁶

Records from the Middle Ages furnish ample testimony that the *De profundis* was then commonly regarded as the psalm for souls. Whole communities were accustomed to pay tribute to a public benefactor by "walking to his grave in solemn procession . . . to say over his ashes a *De profundis* and other supplications for the dead."⁷ Mediaeval wills commonly provide for the recital of this

³ Psalm 45 in the Authorized Version.

⁴ A summary of the traditional interpretation of this psalm by the Church may be found in *The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin*, with a Brief Commentary by Sister M. Mildred, O. S. F., pp. 336-37. At Syon Monastery the *Eructavit* began the psalmody at Prime, as *The Myroure of Our Ladye* affirms: "The fyrste psalm that ye have at this pryme is *Eructavit* that speketh of the spousayle that is betwene our lord Jesu Cryste and holy chyrche." (*Myroure*, p. 135, *EEETS*, E. S. XIX, 1873).

⁵ Dom Prosper Gueranger, *The Liturgical Year*, 6. 89.

⁶ *Little Office of the Blessed Virgin*, p. 380.

⁷ Daniel Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, 3 (pt. 5), 42-43.

"psalm of Davit" for the souls of the testators, by the various ranks of the clergy⁸ or by poor beadsmen;⁹ sometimes even by children.¹⁰ In Masses for the dead the priest would call on the congregation to join him in the *De profundis* for the souls of the beneficiaries.¹¹ Religious communities¹² and cathedral chapters¹³ recited it daily for deceased benefactors and other faithful departed. The nuns of Syon Monastery said it after Tierce before an open grave kept as a perpetual reminder of death.¹⁴

Both manuscript readings of *The Summoner's Tale* retain the essentials of the two-edged jest, the pun on *eructavit* and the picture of bibulous clerics reciting the joyful *Cor meum eructavit* when they should be chanting the solemn *De profundis* for the dead. There is only a choice of emphasis. The commonly accepted rendering with "buf" calls attention to the pun; the Ellesmere, with typical Chaucerian irony, contrasts what might be expected in a reverent prayer for the dead with what actually takes place:

Hir preyere is of ful greet reverence
Whan they for soules sey the psalm of Davit;
Lo, but they seye, "Cor meum eructavit!"

University of Arizona

MARIE P. HAMILTON

SPENSER AND THE "CINQ POINTS EN AMOURS"

Professor Allan H. Gilbert has recently commented on a stanza of *The Faerie Queene* (3.1.45) in which are catalogued the six

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 130 (quoting *Testamenta Vetusta*, 2.450); p. 131 (quoting *Monasticon Anglicanum*, 1.21, and Blomefield's *Norfolk*, 4.417).

⁹ *E. g.*, Richard Whittington, celebrated lord mayor of London (d. 1423), endowed a college of priests and an almshouse for thirteen poor beadsmen, with the request that they say the *De profundis* daily for the souls of his wife, himself, "and Christen people." (Rock, p. 134, n. 22, quoting *Stow's Survey of London*, iii, 4.)

¹⁰ *E. g.*, the will of Robert Fabyan, quoted by Rock, p. 134, n. 22.

¹¹ Rock, pp. 129-31.

¹² F. A. Gasquet, *English Monastic Life*, pp. 126-27.

¹³ Christopher Wordsworth, *Mediaeval Services in England*, pp. 20, 99. See also *Horae Eboracenses*, Surtees Society, 132; xix, 29, 31.

¹⁴ *Mynoure of Our Ladye*, pp. xxxvii-xxxix, 142-46.

knights overcome by the knight of Chastity, Britomart.¹ The matter, however, will bear further elucidation. I quote the stanza in question:

The first of them by name *Gardante* hight,
A iolly person, and of comely vew;
The second was *Parlante*, a bold knight,
And next to him *Iocante* did ensew;
Basciante did him selfe most curteous shew;
But fierce *Bacchante* seemd too fell and keene;
And yet in armes *Noctante* greater grew.
All were faire knights, and goodly well beseene,
But to faire *Britomart* they all but shadowes beene.

The names obviously signify an amatory progression. Mr. Gilbert has illustrated them by a passage from Chaucer (*Persones Tale*, lines 852-62), by another from James Yonge's *Gouvernaunce of Princes* (E. E. T. S., 1898, pp. 138-9), by some verses from the *Carmina Burana* (Stuttgart, 1847, p. 151), and finally by a parallel from Lucian (*Amores* 53). He emphasizes "the arrangement in an ascending series" of the steps indicated by the names, a feature of all the examples, and suggests that Lucian may be the ultimate source of the idea, or even the immediate source of Spenser. These parallels are interesting, and have not been brought together before, but they are somewhat off the main track of the motive in question.

The theme appears to belong primarily to mediaeval French literature. It has been studied by Paul Laumonier for his work on Ronsard.² He traces it back to the troubadours, citing Guiraut de Calanson and his troubadour commentator, Riquier.³ Coming down to the sixteenth century, he finds it in Jean Lemaire de Belges:⁴ "Les nobles poètes disent que cinq lignes y ha en amours, c'est-à-dire cinq points ou cinq degrez especiaux. C'est à sçavoir le regard, le parler, l'attouchement, le baiser, et le dernier . . . c'est celui qu'on nomme . . . le don de mercy." Laumonier adds

¹ *MLN.*, LVI (1941), 594-6.

² *Ronsard poète lyrique* (Paris, 1909), pp. 514-5.

³ Guiraut de Calanson in Raynouard's *Leviqne roman*, s. v., "Portal." [now see W. Ernst's ed. in *Romanische Forschungen*, XLIV (1930), 321]: "En son palaitz lai on s'en vai jazer | A cinc portals." Riquier, as translated by Anglade (*Guiraut Riquier* (Paris, 1905), p. 255), explains the five gates as "le desir," "l'humble prière," "le servir," "le baiser," and "le fait par lequel meurt l'amour."

⁴ *Illustrations de Gaule*, I, 25 (end).

Marot's epigram, *Des cinq poinctz en amours* (Jannet III, 23),⁵ a Latin epigram by Muret (*Ad Paulam*), Maclou de la Haye, "Les cinq Contentemens en Amour" (*Œuv. poét.*, ff. 27-30), and a sonnet by Ronsard (ed. Blanchemain, I, 95).⁶

Except the passage from Lucian, which is, after all, rather different, Mr. Gilbert's parallels move to this French tradition as to a magnet: the five fingers of the devil in Chaucer (lookinge, touchinge, foule wordes, kissinge, dede of lecherie), the passage of the *Secretum Secretorum* translated by Yonge (colloquium, visus, contactus, basia, risus, where the last is an obvious substitution), and the student-song (ludere, contemplari, tangere, osculari, agere). The arrangement somewhat suggests the rhetorical figure of "climax":⁷ compare ἡδονῆς κλίμαξ in Lucian, "degrez" in Lemaire de Belges, and "pair of stairs to marriage" in a well-known Shakesperian parallel.⁸

Fleur de quinze ans (si Dieu vous saulve et gard),
J'ay en amours trouvé cinq poinctz exprès:
Premierement, il y a le regard,
Puis le devis, et le baiser après;
L'attouchement le baiser suyt de près,
Et tous ceulx là tendent au dernier point,
Qui est: Et quoy? Je ne le diray point. . . .

⁵I am at present unable to consult the poems of Maclou de la Haye. Ronsard's sonnet merely alludes to the theme. Laumonier brings into his discussion a number of names, Ovid, Boccaccio, Boiardo, and others, without closer reference, and, I judge, only as authors of poems of the *basia*-type. The Greek Anthology, which he mentions, does include an epigram (*A. P.* 5. 94) embodying almost the series in question. From this epigram the theme comes into a second sonnet of Ronsard, where Laumonier, however (Ron, *ed. crit.*, v, 112, n. 2), against the testimony of Muret, rejects the epigram as source, preferring the mediaeval *cinq points*: mistakenly, as I shall show elsewhere. According to Laumonier also, the *cinq points* appear in the first part of the *Roman de la Rose*, but he cannot mean these particular five points. In fact, in Laumonier's discussion the particular theme is not quite disengaged from kindred motives.

⁶See Lane Cooper, "The Climax," in his *Aristotelian Papers* (Ithaca, 1939), p. 45.

⁷⁸*As You Like It*, v, ii, 35 "Rosalind. . . for your brother and my sister no sooner met but they looked, no sooner looked but they loved, no sooner loved but they sighed, no sooner sighed but they asked one another the reason, no sooner knew the reason but they sought the remedy; and in these degrees have they made a pair of stairs to marriage which they will climb incontinent." Apart from pointless conjectures about the phrase

The main tradition, then, as Laumonier insists, puts the number of degrees at five: Now, though direct sources for the theme in Chaucer and Spenser have not been discovered, the context in both instances makes it clear in what kind of writings the sources should be looked for. In *The Persones Tale* the theme appears just at the point at which in the analogous mediaeval homilies and instructions for priests there commonly occurs an enumeration of the dangers to chastity incurred through the five senses. For example, in John Myre's *Instruction for Parish Priests* (E. E. T. S., 1868, p. 41) the topics are arranged under the heads, *de visu*, *de auditu*, *de olfactu*, *de gustu*, *de tactu*. Or, to take a treatise wholly concerned with chastity, the thirteenth-century *Hali Meidenhad*, we there read:⁹

Lechery, with the help of the fleshly will, warreth on maidenhood in this wise. Her first support is sight: if thou gazest often intently upon any man, lechery anon prepares herself to make war on thy virginity, and first peers upon it, face to face. Speech is her second help. If afterwards ye talk together in an idle way, and speak of unprofitable matters, lechery saith, 'Shame the grace of thy maidenhood,' and vexes it terribly, and threatens to do it shame and harm afterwards. And she keeps her promise; for soon the kiss cometh forth, and that is her third support; then lechery, to shame and to disgrace, spits in maidenhood's face. The fourth support towards running maidenhood is improper handling. Guard her, then! For if ye then handle yourselves in any place improperly, then lechery smiteth on the virtue of maidenhood, and woundeth it sore: so that the dreary deed at last giveth the dint of death.

It seems scarcely doubtful that the "cinq points en amour" represent a secularization of this "instruction" of the handbooks. Chaucer and Spenser, for their part, pretty certainly depended, not on a "literary" treatment of the five points from the secular point of view, but directly on one of the moral treatises; for Spenser's

"pair of stairs," the commentators on Shakespeare seem to have left this passage bare; but see Professor Cooper's article cited above. It ought surely to be viewed in connection with the mediaeval theme that we are here considering.

⁹E. E. T. S., 1922, p. 22. I quote from Furnivall's modernized text. Compare also *Ayenbite of Inwit* (E. E. T. S., 1866, p. 204) where the five senses are five "gates" (cf. Guiraut, above, n. 3). See also G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 382-3. Chaucer's figure, "the five fingers of the devil," clearly belongs to the rhetorical devices of the mediaeval pulpit.

canto is also an imaginative Instruction on Chastity. It is only because the passages from Lucian and the Anthology¹⁰ likewise embody amatory conceits from the five senses that at first sight they seem to be "the same" as the mediaeval examples.

Spenser's list, however, is peculiar in that it contains not five but six names, the "fierce Bacchante" having no parallel in the tradition as we know it. For the present we must be content to emphasize this anomaly, and wait until a larger collection of instances is available.¹¹ The names, be it noted, are in Italian, but probably only to suit the knights to their liege-lady, Malecasta, and not because Spenser here followed an Italian source. Apart from "Bacchante" his list agrees with the tradition. The order agrees with the moral treatises, as does also that of Jean Lemaire: "Gardante" = "le regard"; "Parlante" = "le parler"; "Iocante" = "l'attouchement" "Basciante" = "le baisier"; and "Noc-tante" = "don de mercy." If any one objects to making the equivalence, "Iocante" = "l'attouchement," he can, but without my approval, emend Iocante to Toccante.

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

JOHN DONNE AND VIRGINIA IN 1610

The purpose of this note is to direct attention to a neglected moment in Donne's life and to suggest a date for *Elegy V, His Picture*.

In Feb. 1610 (New Style) John Chamberlain wrote in one of his news-letters to Dudley Carleton, "Newes here [in London] is none at all but that John Dun seekes to be preferred to be secretarie of Virginia."¹ That Donne should try to obtain a post involving great peril and a long absence in so remote a land indicates something of his state of mind in 1610.² At this time he was thirty-

¹⁰ Note 6, above.

¹¹ Yet we may tentatively point to the expression "uncleue ragyngis" in a list quoted by Owst (*op. cit.*, p. 382, n. 3) from a sermon-manuscript.

¹ John Chamberlain, *Letters*, ed. Norman E. McClure (Philadelphia, 1939), II, 284.

² Leslie Hotson, *I, William Shakespeare* (New York, 1937), p. 235, gives a misleading account of the business: "Early in 1609 the poet John Donne made an effort to get himself appointed 'secretarie at Virginia,' but found

seven years old and had been married nine years. He was struggling in the middle years before his acceptance in 1615 of holy orders. He was burdened with debts and a large family. The secretaryship of Virginia was not at that early date a very important post; it might, however, place him in the way of advancement to such a position as that held by his friend Henry Wotton, who was ambassador at Naples. We are able to recognize in his attempt to go to Virginia a desperate effort to bolt from a frustrated circumstance.

Donne's interest in Virginia is shown not only in this episode. In one of his verse letters to the Countess of Bedford (who held her share in the Company) he mentions, "We've added to the world Virginia"; and in *Elegy XIV, A Tale of a Citizen and his Wife*, while listing the topics of the day he writes,

Ask'd if the Custom Farmers held out still,
Of the Virginian plot.

His old friend Christopher Brooke became legal advisor to the Company. As Dean of St. Paul's Donne preached a sermon on missions in Virginia before the Company.

Grierson³ suggests that the *Elegies* were written in the main between 1593 and 1598. He adds, however, that *Elegy XIV* cannot be earlier than 1609 from the nature of its topical allusions. *Elegy V, His Picture*, when considered in the light of the foregoing remarks, may perhaps be claimed for a later date than Grierson suggests. The following are the first thirteen lines of *His Picture*:

Here take my Picture; though I bid farewell,
Thine, in my heart, where my soule dwels; shall dwell.

himself passed over in favor of Jonson's and Digges' friend, William Strachey." The Old Style calendar seems to have been ignored by Mr. Hotson. Chamberlain's Feb. 1609 is, of course, our Feb. 1610, since the English New Year began then about March 25. Strachey had sailed months before on the *Sea Venture* to take the secretaryship and was thought to be lost with that vessel. Donne was thus applying for a post fallen vacant by the supposed loss of the ship. The news of the remarkable survival of the company of the *Sea Venture* after nine months on the Bermudas reached London at least four months after the date of Chamberlain's letter. These facts only make clearer Donne's sense of the danger he was inviting should he undertake the Virginian voyage.

³ *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), II, 62.

'Tis like me now, but I dead, 'twill be more
 When wee are shadowes both, then 'twas before
 When weather-beaten I come backe; my hand,
 Perhaps with rude oares torne, or Sunbeams Tann'd,
 My face and brest of hairecloth, and my head
 With cares rash sodaine stormes, being o'rspread,
 My body a sack of bones, broken within,
 And powders blew staines scattered on my skinne;⁴
 If rivall fooles taxe thee to'have lov'd a man,
 So foule, and course, as Oh, I may seeme than,
 This shall say what I was

These lines may have been written in 1610 while Donne was thinking of undertaking the Virginian voyage. It is not unusual for poets to seize upon an anticipated experience and make something of it beforehand. Returned adventurers were fairly common in London and were often a fearful sight. We do not know to whom *His Picture* was addressed; if to his wife, it could not refer to any other voyage than to the Virginian, for his days of adventurous travel were over when he married. His trip to Germany in his later years was made in complete security with a large company.⁵

Regardless of the date of *His Picture*, it is clear that in order to understand Donne's middle years one must realize the extent of a desperation acute enough to cause him to be willing to leave his family and all the accustomed usages of an intellectual society for the fevers and famine of Virginia in 1610.

HAROLD COOPER

University of Virginia

SHAKESPEARE'S PURGATIVE DRUG *CYME*

Two recent contributions to this journal have called attention to the struggles Shakespearean editors have had with the word *cyme* in *Macbeth* v, iii, 55-6:

⁴ Captain John Smith took ship from Jamestown for England on Oct. 4, 1609. He was suffering from severe burns caused by an accidental explosion of gunpowder. He arrived in London a couple of months before the date of Chamberlain's letter announcing Donne's application for the secretaryship.

⁵ John Sparrow, "The Date of Donne's Travels," *A Garland For John Donne*, ed Theodore Spencer (Cambridge, Mass., 1931) makes no mention of *His Picture*. In considering the probability that it was written on the eve of one of his voyages to the Azores in his young manhood, we have to decide whether it sounds like an adventurous youth; perhaps it does.

What Rubarb, cyme, or what Purgatiue drugge
Would scowre these English hence

Discarding the reading of *F*₁, *cyme*, as an error of some sort, since no purgative of that name exists, they have chosen to follow the emendations of *F*₂ and *F*₃ or of *F*₄, or to propose others of their own.

In *F*₂ and *F*₃ the word is changed to *Cæny*, presumably a variant of *sene*, which the *NED.* lists as an older doublet of *senna*.¹ In *F*₄ *senna*, the usual modern reading, is substituted. The plausibility of this emendation of *cyme* to *sene* or *senna* is challenged by Mr. A. R. Dunlap,² for he points out that it is hardly reasonable to assume a double error on the part of transcriber or compositor, who would have had to substitute an *m* for an *n* as well as a *y* for an *e*.

Other proposed emendations are both more and less plausible than the preceding one. Less plausible certainly is that of Badham,³ who suggests that *cyme* is an error for *clysme*, meaning "deluge," a form and meaning not found in English, however, except in *cataclysm*. Furthermore, the meaning "deluge" is hardly appropriate in the passage here considered. Just as far fetched is Nicholson's emendation of *Cynea* or *Cynee*, i. e. *Canina Brassica* or "mercury."⁴ The best of the emendations proposed is that of Dunlap, who suggests that the original is *tyme*, a common variant of *thyme*, used sometimes as a purgative in the 16th century.⁵ The change of *c* to *t* is plausible, the meaning is not unsatisfactory, and the monosyllable gives us a metrically acceptable line. The only objection to it—and it applies as well to the other readings proposed—is the fact that it is an emendation.

I agree with Mr. Sullivan⁶ in thinking that emendation may be unnecessary, but his suggestion that *cyme* may be explained as a variant of *sium* seems to me to be dubious, for it is doubtful that

¹ *Sene* < OF. *sené*, *senna* < Mod L *senna*.

² *MLN*, LIV (1939), 92-4.

³ Cited in the Furness *Variorum*, as is also that of Nicholson, mentioned below.

⁴ See *NED.*: *mercury* IV, b.

⁵ Mr. Frank Sullivan (*MLN.*, LVI [1941], 263-4) points out however that Shakespeare does not elsewhere use *thyme* to denote a purgative.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

sium has ever been commonly known or used as a purgative⁷ and the form *cyme* is not a very likely spelling variant of *sium*.⁸

I suggest that *cyme* may be explained as a doublet of the relatively common word *cumin*, which the *NED.* defines as "A . . . plant . . . which possesses carminative powers." Both *cyme* and *cumin* may have developed from OE. *cymen*.⁹

The objection to regarding Shakespeare's *cyme* as a doublet of *cumin* is the fact that his is apparently the only recorded usage of this form. On the other hand, since the form is derivable from an earlier word in the language, since the meaning thus provided fits the passage to perfection,¹⁰ and above all since it enables us to do away with emendation, I suggest that *cyme* has something in its favor.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of Florida

⁷ The *Am. Jour. of Pharmacy* (1876), pp 348 ff and 483 ff. describes its poisonous properties, but only incidentally mentions the fact that these may cause purging. It may be worth noting also that Middleton's (*The Witch*, I, ii, 39) *sium* is not a purgative

⁸ *Sium*, a learned borrowing, has no variants that I can find. Furthermore, it is of course dissyllabic

⁹ The *NED* suggests that if *cumin* developed from OE. *cymen* it was influenced by the French *cumin*, but this, though it may be true, is unnecessary

In the proposed development of OE. *cymen* > Shakespeare's *cyme*, three points need comment: (1) The loss of *-en*. This is common (Jordan, *Handbuch der me Gram.*, ¶ 170). (2) The length of the vowel. The spelling *y* plus final *e* in *cyme* undoubtedly represents a diphthong which develops from earlier *i*. But OE *y*, later *i*, should not lengthen in an open syllable to *i*. I suggest that the vowel in *cymen* was long—as, according to Eckhardt, who has most thoroughly investigated this particular point, it should have been, for it comes from Latin *cuminum*. (See ¶s 31 and 49, "Die quantität einfacher tonvokale in offener silbe bei zwei- oder dreisilbigen wörtern französischer herkunft im heutigen englisch," *Anglia*, LX [1936]). I suspect that the evidence for regarding the vowel as short in OE. consists chiefly or entirely in the existence of the ME. *cumin*. but the short vowel here may be readily explained as due to shortening or to French influence (3) The spelling *c* in *cyme*. It is rare that *c* is used for initial [k] before *y* after 1400. True, the *NED.* cites a 16th c. *cy-* form for *kiss* (<OE. *cyssan*). I would assume however that the *c* in *cyme* is due to the regular *c*-spelling in its doublet *cumin*. It is obvious of course that for metrical reasons the common word *cumin* was not suitable.

¹⁰ The purging power of rhubarb plus the carminative power of *cyme* (*cumin*) would be excellent for *scouring*, i. e. purging (see the *NED.* *scour* vb, 2, sense 7), the English hence.

ADDISON'S *MIXT WIT*

An examination of Addison's doctrine of *comparison*, or *agreement*, as expressed in his papers on The Pleasures of the Imagination, seems to make possible a backward glance at the vexed term of *mixt wit*, which Addison applied to the verse of Cowley in *Spectator*, 62.

According to Addison, the esthetic pleasures are of two kinds: "those pleasures of the imagination which arise from the actual view and survey of outward objects; and these, I think, all proceed from the sight of what is great, uncommon, or beautiful";¹ and the "secondary pleasure of the imagination which proceeds from that action of the mind, which compares the ideas arising from the original objects, with the ideas we receive from the statue, picture, description, or sound that represents them."² The act of comparison is of two-fold value, then, if an artist chooses a great, uncommon, or beautiful object, and projects it in terms equivalent to the object itself; thus the artist addresses both the primary and secondary pleasures of the imagination at the same time. Obviously a true artist will embrace both pleasures, "because here we are not only delighted with comparing the representation with the original, but are highly pleased with the original itself."³ In referring to the secondary pleasures of the imagination only, Addison thinks that the act of *comparison* "makes the several kinds of wit pleasant, which consists, as I have formerly shown, in the affinity of ideas: and we may add, it is this also that raises the little satisfaction we sometimes find in the different sorts of false wit."⁴ Since ideas are expressed by words, and since words are the expressive medium of poetry, it appears that poetry may present peculiar problems.

A poet is faced with greater complexities of expression than a painter or sculptor, because their mediums of expression cause them to produce works which will be in suitable agreement with the objects of nature. "Among the different kinds of representation, statuary is the most natural, and shows us something likest the object that is represented . . . a picture bears a real resemblance to

¹ *Spectator*, 412.² *Spectator*, 416.³ *Spectator*, 418.⁴ *Spectator*, 416. (It is to be noted that Addison writes of true and false wit in the passage referred to, but says nothing on *mixt wit*.)

its original, which letters and syllables are wholly void of." ⁵ Moreover, a poet should choose a proper object with which to bring his words into agreement. If a poet does not choose an object or concept that is great, uncommon, or beautiful, the pleasure which a reader will derive will be only one, or a secondary pleasure, "which is nothing else but the action of the mind, which compares the ideas that arise from words, with the ideas that arise from the objects themselves . . . For this reason, therefore, the description of a dunghill is pleasing to the imagination, if the image be presented to our minds by suitable expressions." ⁶

It is to be noted, however, that Addison cannot allow this secondary pleasure to be a true imaginative pleasure: "though, perhaps, this may be more properly called a pleasure of the understanding than of the fancy." ⁷ In other words, Addison cannot be pleased with poetry written on unsuitable subjects; that is, images or concepts incapable of producing the primary pleasures. On the other hand, it is to be supposed that if poetry were written on a suitable subject, but made demands on the understanding faculty (or intellect) which may arouse the secondary pleasures only, by producing the "little satisfaction we find in the different sorts of false wit" such poetry would be deficient in the quality of complete agreement.

In *Spectator*, 62, on true and false wit, Addison places Cowley in a middle position as a poet of *mixt wit*. Considering love to be a suitable object for poetry projected in suitable expression as heat or fire, Addison assumes Cowley to be in possession of a primary pleasure of the imagination. "The passion of love in its nature has been thought to resemble fire; for which reason the words fire and flame are made use of to signify love." This, according to Addison, is a proper comparison, and an indication of true wit. When, however, the poet twists or obstructs the easy flow of the *comparison*, causing the reader to use his intellect in order to come to an agreement with the object, the secondary pleasure of the imagination will not directly follow, because the operation of the *understanding*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Spectator*, 418.

⁷ *Ibid.* (Addison's working definition of *understanding* appears in *Spectator*, 411: "We might here add, that the pleasures of the fancy are more conducive to health, than those of the understanding, which are worked out by dint of thinking, and attended with too violent a labor of the brain.")

(consciousness through words) supervenes. In a single paragraph of *Spectator*, 62, Addison produces fifteen examples of this sort of *mixt wit* in Cowley.

After setting forth examples of Cowley's *mixt wit*, Addison is obliged to defend the poet by saying that he had "as much true wit as any author that ever writ; and indeed all other talents of an extraordinary genius." However, by using examples from "the admirable poet," Addison concludes that *mixt wit* is based "partly in falsehood and partly in truth: Reason puts in her claim for one half of it, and Extravagance for the other." In other words, Addison believed that Cowley, in choosing the object of love, which is great and beautiful, if not uncommon, was inviting the primary pleasures of the imagination; but since "the image he presented to our minds" was not by "suitable expressions," the process of comparison was not properly equated with the object. There was no "action of the mind, which compares the ideas that arise from words, with the ideas that arise from the objects themselves." In order to accept the figure, the rational faculty came into operation "by dint of thinking, and attended with too violent a labor of the brain." Words were used to construct the comparison in the *understanding*, not to extend it through the imagination, or fancy. What appears is a primary pleasure on the one hand, plus an effort of the understanding on the other. The result is "Extravagance," or possibly "falsehood" (inadequate *comparison*), which "consists partly in" the intellect or understanding, not of the imagination.

This joining of the faculty of understanding with a primary pleasure of the imagination was what Addison called *mixt wit*, and what Dr. Johnson referred to later as "conceits . . . far-fetched."

ROBERT L. MORRIS

University of Arkansas

THE TEXT OF EDWARD YOUNG'S LETTERS TO SAMUEL RICHARDSON

In 1854 when the printer James Nichols prepared an edition of the works of Edward Young,¹ "poetry and prose . . . revised and

¹ *Complete Works . . . of the Rev Edward Young, LL. D. . . . to which is prefixed, A Life of the Author, by John Doran, LL. D.* 2 vols. London: William Tegg and Co.

collated with the earliest editions," Young's literary fame was about at an end. Within three years, George Eliot rang the knell in the *Westminster Review* with a well-aimed jibe at the efforts of the clergy to keep alive memory of this eighteenth century cleric whose invasion of the domain of poetry she condemned as "radically insincere."¹ Unfortunately, although Nichols' edition is the last attempt at a critical text, the letters of Young to the novelist Richardson which appear in it are taken directly from the unreliable text of Mrs. Anna Letitia Barbauld's *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*.²

As the manuscripts of the Young-Richardson correspondence from which Mrs. Barbauld worked have disappeared,³ the mangled treatment of them in the Barbauld edition can be realized only by comparison with the much more extensive publication of the correspondence by Phillips in the *Monthly Magazine* between 1813 and 1819.⁴ Comparison reveals that of the 20 letters in the Barbauld edition purportedly from Young to Richardson, three are identical in both editions, three contain additional material not in the *Monthly Magazine*, five are not found at all in the *Monthly Magazine*, one is an abridgement, and the remaining eight are unique pastiches of excerpts culled from as many as four letters over a period of ten years. In the following tabulation, numbers in the first column are those given to the Barbauld letters in the Nichols' edition; those in the second column are those of the series published in the *Monthly Magazine*. Where several letters occur in the second column opposite one in the first, the source of Mrs. Barbauld's excerpts is indicated. Where the dates and items correspond, the letters are identical unless otherwise noted.

² 6 vols. London: Richard Phillips. 1804.

³ An exception is Young's letter to Richardson of 7 August 1751, which was offered for sale by an American firm in 1938. It is interesting to note that the manuscript differs only in spelling from the published form in the *Monthly Magazine* for 1 April 1815.

⁴ In fact, the Barbauld edition is so mangled that the resemblance between the Young letters in it and those published in the *Monthly Magazine* apparently escaped the attention of Professor A. D. McKillop, one of the first to call attention to the latter (cf. "Richardson, Young, and the Conjectures," *Modern Philology*, xxii (1925), 391-404), who recently remarked: "Mrs. Barbauld printed some Richardson-Young letters, and fortunately about one hundred and fifty more were published by Phillips in the *Monthly Magazine* from 1813 to 1819, before this part of the material disappeared." (*Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist*, Chapel Hill, 1936, p. 285.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| I 20 April 1744 | IV 8 December 1744 |
| | XVIII 20 April 1746 |
| | XVII undated |
| II 9 July 1744 | VI 6 December 1744 |
| | III 9 July 1744 |
| | IX 2 May 1745 |
| | XXXI 24 November 1747 |
| III 1744 (otherwise identical) | LXXVI 14 July 1754 |
| IV 18 February 1745 | I 20 June 1744 |
| | VII 18 February 1745 |
| V 26 November 1745 | VIII 4 March 1745 |
| | XII 26 November 1745 |
| VI 10 December 1745 | XXI 17 August 1746 |
| | XIV 10 December 1745 |
| | XV 19 December 1745 |
| VII 17 July 1746 | XVI 19 March 1746 |
| Contains one paragraph
not in <i>Monthly Magazine</i> | XX 17 July 1746 |
| VIII 11 November 1746 | XXII 11 November 1746 |
| | XXIV 16 November 1746 |
| | XXIII 2 December 1746 |
| IX 17 May 1747 | XXX 17 May 1747 |
| | XXVII 9 April 1747 |
| X 5 August 1747 | |
| XI 8 May 1749 | |
| XII 5 November 1749 | |
| XIII 14 March 1754 | LXXXVI 14 March 1754 |
| XIV 20 September 1755 | XCIX 20 September 1755 |
| XV 21 July 1757 | CXVII 21 July 1757 |
| | CV 27 April 1756 |
| XVI 23 October 1757 | |
| XVII 3 January 1758 | CXXI 3 January 1758 |
| Contains three paragraphs
not in <i>Monthly Magazine</i> | |
| XVIII 30 April 1758 | CXXIII 30 April 1758 |
| Contains one paragraph
not in <i>Monthly Magazine</i> | |
| XIX 8 September 1760 | |
| [XX] 14 May 1758 (Not re-
printed in Nichols' edi-
tion) | CXXV 14 May 1758 |
| | Contains one paragraph
not in Barbault edition |

HENRY PETTIT

FIELDING AND "THE FIRST GOTHIC REVIVAL"

Some years ago Professor Lovejoy dated "the first Gothic revival" in the 1740's, when, under the influence of Batty Langley and Sanderson Miller, there took place in England a "movement for the actual building of new structures in what was supposed to be this style," a fashion "in domestic structures rather than in churches."¹ Later the movement declined, with many of its earlier adherents abjuring their faith.² There appears to be a close illustration of this development in several works of Henry Fielding.

In chapter four of *A Journey from This World to the Next*, written in 1741 and 1742,³ Fielding describes an "extremely magnificent" Palace of Death: "The structure was of the Gothic order; vast beyond imagination, . . ." By "of the Gothic order" he could have meant that the architecture was Gothic or that the Palace produced the impressions—of venerableness, vastness, or gloominess—often loosely designated by *Gothic*. The former, however, is strongly suggested by his use of *order*.⁴ At any rate, he does use *Gothic* with reference to a building; he is not only familiar with the term but not averse to what it denotes; he does not decry the effect as "irregular" or as otherwise deviating from Augustan canons.

In 1746-48, when he was writing *Tom Jones* ⁵ Fielding was more unmistakably well disposed toward Gothic, as appears in the well-known description of Allworthy's house in chapter four: "The Gothic style of building could produce nothing nobler. . . . There was an air of grandeur in it that struck you with awe, and rivalled the beauties of the best Grecian architecture; . . ." Fielding goes on to describe the surroundings—hill, grove, cascade, lake, river, on the right of which appeared "one of the towers of an old ruined abbey, grown over with ivy." And on the left: ". . . a very fine park, composed of very *unequal* ground, and *agreeably varied* with all the *diversity* that hills, lawns, wood, and water, laid out with

¹ Arthur O. Lovejoy, "The First Gothic Revival and the Return to Nature," *MLN.*, XLVII (1932), 432, 433.

² *Ibid.*, p. 434.

³ Wilbur L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), I, 395-396.

⁴ See *NED.*, "Order, sh," I, 4.

⁵ Cross, *op. cit.*, II, 100.

admirable taste, but owing less to art than to Nature, could give" (*italics mine*). Here, plainly, is the type of thinking which Professor Lovejoy found providing the major justification of Gothic: the "transfer of the aesthetic *principle of irregularity*—as a newly discovered implication of the rule of 'imitating Nature'—from . . . laying out gardens—to architecture."⁶ With irregularity, variety came into credit, and variety is the essence of Fielding's scene (note the italicized words). True, he is not describing architecture, but he is not dissociating the building and its surroundings; in view of the implied harmony of the scene, the emphasis on "Nature" seems good evidence for Professor Lovejoy's point that the "Goths" managed "to steal the classicists' catchword."⁷

In almost the last words he wrote Fielding again commented on architecture, but in terms that make his final position not easy to define. At the end of the *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon* (1754) he refers to the Hieronymite convent at Belem (Bellisle, he calls it), Lisbon suburb, as "one of the most beautiful piles of building in all Portugal." Since this was in the Manueline style, a combination of Gothic and Renaissance,⁸ he might seem to be expressing further the tastes cultivated during the Gothic vogue—except that he is so very casual, and so lacking in the experience to support the hyperbole. Furthermore, he goes on to describe Lisbon itself thus:

As the houses, convents, churches, &c., are large, and all built with white stone, they look very beautiful at a distance; but as you approach nearer, and find them to want every kind of ornament, all idea of beauty vanishes at once. When I was surveying the prospect of this city, which bears so little resemblance to any other that I have ever seen, a reflexion occurred to me that, if a man was suddenly to be removed from Palmyra hither, and should take a view of no other city, in how glorious a light would the antient architecture appear to him! and what desolation and destruction of arts and science would he conclude had happened between the several aeras of these cities!

In pre-1755 Lisbon there was a good deal of medieval, Mapu-

⁶ P. 437.

⁷ P. 435. Fielding may have been directly influenced by Sanderson Millér, important figure in the new Gothic movement (see Cross, II, 112-114, and Lovejoy, p. 433).

⁸ Walter Crum Watson, *Portuguese Architecture* (London: Constable, 1908), pp. 104, 162, 181 ff. Fielding speaks in the words used regularly in histories of art. Was he repeating a guidebook platitude?

eline, and Renaissance architecture,⁹ in condemning all of which Fielding speaks with vastly more conviction than he does in his bare traveler's truism on Belem. In the latter passage one must evidently seek his real opinion. What is one to conclude? In disparaging everything not "antient," Fielding by implication departs from even the standard admirations of his age; he outclassifies neoclassicism, rejecting, it appears, both its orthodoxies and its heterodoxies. Though by lack of specification he denies one the tempting inference that he had completely deserted the fad of the '40's, he can hardly be said to remember it; his position is now, it seems fair to conclude, quite different from that of Sanderson Miller and the first Gothic revivalists.

ROBERT B. HELLMAN

Louisiana State University

SHELLEY AND THE *CONCIONES AD POPULUM*

It has not previously been noted that the central message of Shelley's *Swellfoot the Tyrant* is the same as that of Coleridge's *A Letter from Liberty to her Dear Friend Famine* in his *Conciones ad Populum*,¹ and that a climactic passage in Shelley's play is based on the concluding paragraph of that letter.

The message of the *Letter from Liberty to her Dear Friend Famine*—and, indeed, of the *Conciones ad Populum* as a whole—is that unless the rulers of England change to more liberal policies, they will be overwhelmed by the forces of revolution generated by economic distress (Famine). The letter concludes as follows:

Thus baffled and friendless, I was about to depart, and stood a fearful lingerer on the Isle, which I had so dearly loved—when tidings were brought me of *your* approach. I found myself impelled by a power superior to me to build my last hopes on you—*Liberty*, the MOTHER OF PLENTY, calls *Famine* to her aid. O FAMINE, most eloquent Goddess! plead thou my cause. I meantime will pray fervently that Heaven may unseal the ears of

⁹ Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 ff., 64, 98, 244 ff.; *Wasmuths Lexikon der Baukunst* (Berlin, 1932), iv, 94 ff.; "Lisbon," *Britannica*, 14th ed.

¹ First published in 1795.

its vicegerents, so that they may listen to your first pleadings, *while yet your voice is faint and distant*, and your counsels peaceable—.

I remain
Your distressed Suppliant,
LIBERTY *

This passage Shelley follows at the conclusion of his play. The rulers of Boeotia (England) hail Famine in a Chorus as the "goddess" who keeps them in control of the state; the people, in another Chorus, hail Famine as the force which will drive them to revolution. Following these choruses "a graceful figure" on whose veil is inscribed "the word LIBERTY" appears to plead with Famine "*in tones at first faint and low*, but which ever become louder and louder":³

I charge thee! when thou wake the multitude,
Thou lead them not upon the paths of blood.
The earth did never mean her foison
For those who crown life's cup with poison
Of fanatic rage and meaningless revenge—
But for those radiant spirits, who are still
The standard-bearers in the van of Change
Be they th' appointed stewards, to fill
The lap of Pain, and Toil, and Age!—
Remit, O Queen! thy accustomed rage!
Be what thou art not! *In voice faint and low*
FREEDOM calls *Famine*,—her eternal foe,
*To brief alliance, hollow truce.—Rise now!*⁴

This parallel is especially interesting in that it indicates a hitherto unnoted interest by Shelley in Coleridge's early (radical) political prose.

KENNETH NEILL CAMERON

Indiana University

FOUR WORDS IN COXE'S *A SHORT TREATISE . . .* *OF MAGICALL SCIENCES*

Francis Coxe's *A short treatise declaringe the detestable wickednesse of magicall sciences, as Necromancie. Coniurations of spirites,*

* Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "Conciones ad Populum," *Essays on his Own Times* (London, 1850), p. 5. Italics mine, except *your*.

³ *Swellfoot the Tyrant*, II, ii Stage direction after line 83. Italics mine.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, ii, 90-102. Italics mine.

Curieuse Astrologie and suche lyke, published by Alde in 1561, a copy of which is in the Henry E. Huntington Library, contains some earlier uses of words than those recorded in *OED*:

proclunittie in "foreseinge y^e proclunittie or redines of mē, how apt & prone thei are to euel," p. Aiiir^r: the first occurrence recorded by *OED* is from H. Smith, *Wks.*, 1591;

adhere in "in doubt it was to which they woulde adhere or stick," p. Av^r: the first occurrence recorded by *OED* is from Bacon, *Ess.*, 1597;

Arologie in "For in the sciences Arologie, Geomācie, Necromancie and such like infinite," p. Av^r: this is evidently a spelling of *aerology*, here used as a synonym for *aeromancy*. *OED* does not give this use of the word at all, its first occurrence in the meaning of "That department of science which treats of the atmosphere" is from Chambers, *Cycl. Supp.*, 1753;

deuastation in "whose vtter deuastation and cōfoūding before God, I most earnestly desire & wishe," p. Avi^r: the first occurrence recorded by *OED* is from Holland, *Plutarch's Mor.*, 1603.

EDWIN J. HOWARD

Miami University,
Oxford, Ohio

GRAY'S OPINION OF PARNELL

Gray in a letter to Mason (August 11, 1758) comments on several books which had attracted his friend's attention: "the books you enquire after are not worth your knowledge. Parnell is the dunghill of Irish-Grubstreet." M. Roger Martin in his *Essai sur Thomas Gray*¹ severely criticizes this cutting reference to Parnell; yet it seems improbable that a critic of Gray's ability would make such a statement without some reason. Gray apparently was reading the 1758 edition of Parnell's works² and in that volume there appears a somewhat unsavoury little poem entitled *Bacchus or the Drunken Metamorphosis*.³ The narrative centers around the efforts

¹ *Essai sur Thomas Gray* (Paris, 1934), p. 337.

² *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (ed. Toynbee and Whibley), Oxford, 1935, II, 579-80, n. 8.

³ *The Posthumous Works of Dr. Thomas Parnell*, Dublin (Printed for Benjamin Gunne, Bookseller in Caple-street), 1758, pp. 278 ff.

of Bacchus and his fauns to restore the withered vines of Lesbos by the generous use of manure; as a consequence, the word *dung* occurs in l. 18 and l. 50 of the poem. In view of this production, which Gray had almost certainly read shortly before writing his letter, it perhaps is not difficult to understand why a man of his rather fastidious temperament should apply such a term as *dunghill* to the author of *Bacchus*.

HERBERT W. STARR

West Virginia University

AN ECHO OF *L'ALLEGRO* IN GRAY'S *BARD*

There appears in the published version of Gray's *Bard* a reminiscence of a line in *L'Allegro* which, obvious though it is, does not seem to have been pointed out in print. Gray's verse now reads: "Girt with many a baron bold."¹ The phrase, *baron bold*, is perhaps drawn from Milton's "the busie humm of men, Where throngs of Knights and Barons bold."² The resemblance is far more noticeable in the original draft of *The Bard*, in which the line is "Haughty Knights, & Barons bold."³ The object of Gray's revision thus may have been not only to obtain a line superior poetically, but also to avoid a word for word repetition of Milton's phrase.

HERBERT W. STARR

West Virginia University

¹ *Bard*, 111.

² *L'Allegro*, 118-119.

³ *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (ed. Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley), Oxford, 1935, II, 502. In the later draft (*ibid.*, I, 436) this reads. "Youthful Knights & Barons bold" corrected to "Girt with many a Baron bold."

REVIEWS

The Athenaeum: a Mirror of Victorian Culture. By LESLIE A. MARCHAND. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 411. \$3.50.

Martin F. Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind. By RALF BUCHMANN. Bern: A. Francke, 1941. Pp. 165. Fr. 9.50. (Swiss Studies in English, 10.)

The Saturday Review, 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England. By MERLE MOWBRAY BEVINGTON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 415. \$3.50. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 154.)

Respect for the honesty of *The Athenaeum: a Mirror of Victorian Culture* grows with its use. The book is important not alone for detail amassed on a great number of prominent and minor nineteenth century writers but for the orientation of the *Athenaeum* itself among the changing thought-ways of the Victorian age and for the interpretation of that long and varied period. Characteristically Leslie Marchand writes:

The appeal which German idealism had for the Victorian romantics was that it could take the sting out of even rationalism and make it possible for all men of good feeling to unite under a common banner of advancement which was itself a sufficient goal. The common enemy was no longer reason or science, but materialism. Seen in this light, many of the apparent inconsistencies of early Victorian criticism are understandable (p. 241).

Those familiar with the *Athenaeum* in any one of its ten decades from 1828 to approximately 1928 may, forgetting this dire length, feel that more attention should have been paid to some particular phase of the weekly, such as the early work of Sterling. Or they may find that Dr. Marchand accredits the *Athenaeum* with more expertness in literary criticism than they remember and may glance over their own annotations on drab summaries, undue praise of Bulwer Lytton or Felicia Hemans, compilations of excerpts, and judgments heavy with the borrowed authority of German idealism. Yet from time to time Dr. Marchand himself takes scholarly cognizance of the shortcomings of this reviewing while he stresses the critical tenets of the periodical, its attempt to secure specialists, its courageous "fight against puffery" under Charles Wentworth Dilke's honest management. In detail he discusses the *Athenaeum's* awareness of the accepted conventions and ideologies of its day, its

typically Victorian refuge in compromises, and its serious desire for reform and progress. Special studies are included tracing through the years the weekly's critical estimates of its great contemporaries, particularly Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley of the earlier writers; Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, Thackeray, Carlyle, Ruskin, and Mill of the later.

Readers should be especially grateful because Dr. Marchand has accomplished the seeming miracle of reporting in a book of 370 odd pages a weekly which spans a century of vicissitudes in policy and practice. What is more, he has secured perspective yet has escaped the too frequent fallacy of dating his own work. Nowhere does he intrude the concepts and terminology of 1941 or pass judgment from the questionable vantage of its experience.

It is quite otherwise with Dr. Buchmann's *Martin F. Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind*. Dr. Buchmann roundly denounces our forefathers with the hope that their "defects will become odious to us, especially, if we perceive the same traits in ourselves" (p. 8), but he gives the impression, particularly in his first two chapters, that he is fighting a battle long since won. Even his own work is full of citations showing how thoroughly the Victorian age has been excoriated from the time of its own satirists. Yet much of his book makes good reading, fortunately offering more a pungent analysis of the Victorian middle class mind than a serious study of Martin Tupper, who becomes its symbol. Dr. Buchmann's familiarity with German occasionally hampers his use of English, as in the sentence: "Arnold's criticism was of too objective a character to be only the outcome of a personal grievance, as it was in the case of Samuel Butler, whose philosophy narrowed down into a satire on Victorian domesticity, education and worship" (p. 20). Yet often Dr. Buchmann's style is as pointed as his subject matter is aculeate.

More significant as a guide to the Victorian age is Merle Mowbray Bevington's well-integrated study, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England*. The sub-title is here instructive. Readers familiar with the files of the once formidable weekly will be amazed at the amount of subject matter from the articles themselves which Mr. Bevington has managed to subsume. His book offers the kind of review long needed, anthological, yet abundant in analysis, coherent, and epitomized, a recreative digest of the creeds, rationalizations, shrewd or obtuse appraisals, and embedded prejudices that swayed educated Victorians during the initial thirteen years of the periodical's long history.

Readers should not be misled by the quiet tone of Mr. Bevington's own writing, for his book records the battles royal of the mid-nineteenth century in practically all fields: politics and economics, religion, science, the arts, literature. He does justice to the hard-

headed, swift-thinking staff of the weekly in their calmer moods; but he makes them most memorable when they are most belligerent, whether they are slashing Browning or Browning's detractors, the opponents of Pre-Raphaelitism or its advocates who hastened its decadence. Vehemently the staff denounced uncompromising conservatives as retarding their age, sentimentalists as rendering it ludicrous, and restive critics like Ruskin as threatening its established decencies and protections. Mr. Bevington freely quotes the staff's more provocative epigrams, such as, There is "enough political immorality in Mr. Carlyle's histories to create a race of brigands." Particularly adroit in use of quotations is the account of the weekly's long battledoor and shuttlecock with Matthew Arnold. Recorded also with especial skill are the wide-spread convulsions caused by Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, convulsions amid which the *Saturday* critics did some of their clearest thinking.

The honesty of Mr. Bevington's work wins confidence. He keeps us aware of the shifts in the staff's point of view with the passage of time; he does not suppress or minimize their more flagrant errors. Never is he their apologist. Throughout he grants the potent *Saturday* reviewers, who so easily conquered their own day, that most rare tolerance of fair field and no favor.

Mr. Bevington has greatly increased the usefulness of his work by appending an extensive list of identified articles in the weekly and brief biographical notes on their authors.

MIRIAM M. H. THRALL

Philadelphia

The Letters of Joseph Addison. Edited by WALTER GRAHAM.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Pp. xxxvi + 527. \$8.00.

The letters by Addison printed in complete form, 428 in number, constitute the body of the book; and those in précis form, his purely official letters, 274 in number, are placed together in Appendix I. In Appendix II are given 40 addressed to him.

It is in every way an admirable book. Tasks facing the editor of a correspondence Mr. Graham has handled with sound judgment. The texts are excellent. Undated letters fall convincingly into place: for example, the early letters to Tonson (nos. 1-3); that to Philips indicating when Addison returned from his travels (no. 43); a group in 1710 (nos. 286, 289, 300); and that interceding for friends (no. 404). Probably, however, no. 414 to Philips is misplaced at the end of the 1714 group (following Bohn), as similar letters from Steele to Philips run earlier, from April, 1712, to March, 1714. The identification of unknown correspondents is well-grounded, particularly of nos. 9, 65, 138a, 416, 426-8, 431. Could it be that Tonson, senior, is the correspondent in those un-

solved puzzles, nos. 129, 135, 136? The annotations are pointed and dependable, if sometimes on the slender side. Surely, George Duckett (nos. 272, 292) deserved a footnote. What had Addison to do with the famous person, Lady Belasyse (nos. 321-3, 325)? And one would like to know about "little Thompson," that "excellent and amiable youth" (nos. 43, 267, 306). The Addison family affairs in India are at last clearly presented, by letter and annotation, but reference to the new available material on Joseph's lawsuit in 1712-13 to recover a share in 4000 pelongs of Indian silk would have explained his remarks in nos. 336 and 349. One small editorial decision might be queried: why is the letter "To a Lady," printed several times in the eighteenth century as Addison's (for example, in *Gent. Mag.*, April, 1762, pp. 180-1), dismissed silently? This would appear to be the place for a judgment upon it.

Many new details of fact about Addison emerge both in letters and annotations; and the orderliness of the whole helps one to find the way more confidently through his biography. This is not to say that the biographical outline is entire or that Addison's reserved personality is completely unfolded. The government official speaks from these pages. The Addison of the essays eludes us as does also the charming man whose witty conversation was remembered by Swift, Pope, Lady Mary, Young, and Steele. Yet, nevertheless, in the distinguished, formal letters of Mr. Secretary, we catch glimpses of "the patience, foresight, and temperate address" of one who "always waited and stemmed the current"—that is, the Addison whom Steele worshipped.

What of the letters that have perished? There are not any for 1716, the year of Addison's marriage. As they are not mentioned, probably no traces were found of letters written by him to the Countess of Warwick. But Oldmixon, writing in 1735, spoke of them, and also, in our time, an informed, reliable writer, who seemed to have definite knowledge of their whereabouts.

To the large number of holographs located and used, minor additions can be made. It may be helpful to know that the original manuscripts of five letters, perforce copied from nineteenth-century printed forms—nos. 161, 251, 288, 324, 382—have in recent years passed through auction and sales room (1917 to 1938). And four others not mentioned at all, their records indicate to be extant: (1) To Lord High Treasurer: "May 14, 1708, resigning his place in the Commission of Appeals" (*American Book Prices Current*, 1917, p. 912). (2) To Henry Newton, English Minister at Florence: "July 16, 1708, referring to political matters and to Sir Godfrey Kneller" (Sotheby, 29 July 1919). (3) To Steele: Malmesbury, March 4, 1710 (see my book, *The Correspondence of Richard Steele*, p. 39). (4) To Ambrose Philips, "over against the End of Tavistock Court": "Tuesday night [1713], The Bishop of Clogher, Colonel Pagett, and myself Dine at Mrs. Bradshaws to-morrow

and are in hopes that you will be of the party. Colonel Pagett will meet you at St. James's Coffee-House at one o'clock and go with you to Kensington, etc." (Sotheby, 27 March 1923).

RAE BLANCHARD

Goucher College

From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to La Mettrie. By LEONORA COHEN ROSENFELD, with a Preface by PAUL HAZARD of the Académie Française. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. xxviii + 353.

In 1933 Professor George Boas, in his *Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century*, recounted the debate over Montaigne's "theriophily" or glorification of animals. Three years later, Miss Hester Hastings, without neglecting the philosophical background, traced the growth of humanitarianism toward animals in her excellent monograph, *Man and Beast in French Thought of the Eighteenth Century*. This present volume by Mrs. Rosenfield "follows the fortune and influence of conflicting theories of animal soul from Descartes to La Mettrie, indicating during that period the transition from animal to human" mechanistic interpretation (p. xiv).

This question of "l'âme des bêtes" was widely discussed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Descartes, as is well known, was a mechanist,—for animals. "The contrast between the perfect regularity of animal behavior and the hesitant uncertainty of human rational conduct," says Mrs. Rosenfield, "first led the young man to his belief in the mechanical nature of all animal processes" (p. 20), though he admitted later that he could not prove it (p. 13). Thus Descartes differed from the Aristotelian position of a sensitive or animal soul, on the one hand, or the Neo-Platonic vitalistic view, according to which soul permeates the universe (p. xxiii), on the other. There was also, as we have seen, Montaigne who, in his *Apologie de Raimond Sebond*, had played with the paradox of animal superiority as a means to the humbling of man's pride (p. xxiv).

Descartes' doctrine in respect to animals, like his philosophy in general, from unorthodox gradually became orthodox. Malebranche, whose work went through twenty French editions by 1772 (p. 45), interpreted animal automatism by means of the philosophy of occasionalism. Bossuet, influenced by Thomas Aquinas and by Descartes, likewise emphasized animal mechanism (pp. 46-47). The Jansenists of Port-Royal took a similar position. Both they

and Malebranche were accused of cruelty to animals owing to their theory of animal insensibility (pp. 69-70).

Meanwhile, various traditionalist thinkers, mostly now 'obscure, continued to express the Peripatetic philosophy of the Aristotelians or the Neo-Platonic vitalism or, as in the case of Legendre de Saint-Aubin in his widely-read *Traité de l'opinion*, reflected rather skeptically, in spite of their prevailing orthodoxy, the chaos of conflicting opinions (pp. 101-102).

But new experimental facilities were developing. Vivisection was more widely practiced. The microscope revealed increasingly a whole new world of "l'infiniment petit." Under these influences, empiricism became more and more wide-spread. Descartes indeed had possessed many of the characteristics of an experimental scientist, but his thought was molded also by his rationalistic pre-conceptions. Now, the empiricists attacked the Cartesian doctrine of the Beast-Machine. Gassendi, Cureau de La Chambre, Pierre Bayle, Locke, Voltaire, were among those who emphasized the essential resemblance, except in degree, between animal and human intelligence. By rejecting the term "spiritual" to characterize man's intelligence, Voltaire, says Mrs. Rosenfield, advanced the spread of the materialistic thesis (p. 132). Occasionally also, he introduced a humanitarian note by his attacks against abuses of vivisection and of slaughtering animals for food (*ibid.*). Cyrano de Bergerac wittily satirized two-legged Cartesians in the presence of superior four-legged beasts (pp. 114-117) in a passage that forecasts Swift's Yahoos amongst the Houyhnhnms.

In 1748, at length, La Mettrie brought out his book with the provocative title, *L'Homme machine*, which forms the culmination of Mrs. Rosenfield's study. La Mettrie, she reminds us, "over-dramatized his case to drive home his point" (p. 144). She explains:

Obviously the author did not conceive of man as a pure automaton. . . . Like Descartes, La Mettrie thought that body operates in accordance with mechanical laws. Unlike Descartes, however, he denied the existence of any soul whose essence is entirely distinct from extended matter. In brief, all soul for La Mettrie seemed conditioned by the organization of the body, and the superiority of humans over animals he deemed variously a function of their more developed brain structure, bodily organization or needs (pp. 143-144).

Thus the pendulum had swung full-circle. "Man, like the beasts, is a machine, and that means only that the functioning of the body operates mechanically, not animistically or mystically" (p. 144).

Mrs. Rosenfield has carried out her study, in which it would be easy to take sides, with calm objectivity. In spite of all the long discussion of the past, "believers in animal intelligence," she says, "have still to debate with the automatists, just as believers in human soul have still to reckon with behavioristic opposition" (p.

xxi). Mrs. Rosenfield's volume is based upon a wealth of material, carefully documented in Notes at the end of the text. Throughout, there is an admirable maturity of thought and style, a firmness of touch, which indicate complete mastery of a difficult subject. This book is an important contribution to the literary background of a period rich in the history of human thought. As M. Paul Hazard writes in his excellent Preface to Mrs. Rosenfield's volume,

to know a past which alone can explain our present, is a necessity for any thinking creature . . . Faced as we are with the invasion of mechanism, what better remedy than to ponder the great problems once again? Confronted with doctrines that exert their contempt of intelligence, what better remedy than the free exercise of the critical mind (p. xi)?

GEORGE R. HAVENS

The Ohio State University

Goldoni in Spain. By PAUL PATRICK ROGERS. Oberlin, Ohio:
The Academy Press, 1941. Pp. x + 109.

Professor Rogers had noted (p. 2) that in the vast bibliography of Goldoni, treatment of Spain was lacking. The present volume fills this gap. The author explains in his foreword that the civil war in Spain interrupted plans that included examination of Spanish manuscripts and editions of Goldoni's works and of the periodicals of the day. Rather than postpone publication indefinitely, he continued his work with recourse to secondary materials, fortunately rather abundant. The appendices contain long lists of musical plays and comedies performed or published in Madrid and Barcelona, with excellent comments on individual items. The Spanish performances belong chiefly to the middle and end of the eighteenth century and the first years of the nineteenth.

Besides the appendices and bibliography Mr. Rogers has supplied about forty pages of general comment. Both comment and appendices are so admirably arranged and well-documented, so eminently fair and human, and so marked by insight into relations among various countries and among authors and actors, producers, critics and public, that they give real pleasure and profit to any reader. The present reviewer would like only to comment on a few generalizations which have caused him a little surprise. Mr. Rogers deduces (p. 1) that the infrequency of performance of Goldoni's plays recently in Spain and other countries "may seem to indicate, that Goldoni has little to say to the non-Italian of our day," and that "universality is not the hallmark of Goldoni's genius." Without denying some measure of truth to these generalizations, it is probably true that almost no dramatic author survives

on the popular stage before posterity without some sort of cultural tradition or subsidy. Mr. Rogers states (p. 2) that Spanish translators sinned greatly in their acknowledgment of original sources. But so do all translators and adapters for a truly "popular" medium. Public and producers are interested only in the work itself, unless there is some particular thrill or *réclame* to be gained from mention of the original source. Mr. Rogers is somewhat puzzled (p. 34) in estimating the comparative popularity in Spain of Goldoni and Alfieri (the latter based on a study by Professor Peers), because of course one would naturally expect Goldoni to be more "popular" than Alfieri; and indeed Mr. Rogers is disposed to think that he was, but with commendable reserve he avoids a dogmatic statement in a complex situation.

This reviewer is a little surprised by the emphasis which Mr. Rogers gives to Goldoni's unhappiness in Paris (p. 1) and to that of Metastasio in Vienna (p. 9). On the other hand he finds great insight in the final paragraph (p. 42) of the text, to the effect that the conservative Goldoni could not compete with the liberal aggressiveness of his French contemporaries, even though the French plays were often less worthy. However, is it quite correct to call these French authors "contemporaries?"

This book is marked by careful, competent organization of material, and by recognition of the multiplicity of elements that control a theatrical "vogue." Incidentally, many complacent readers of Goldoni's comedies (including the present reviewer) will be surprised by the popularity of his texts for music.

JOHN VAN HORNE

University of Illinois

Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève. Par YVONNE BÉZARD. Paris: Boivin et Cie, 1939. Pp. 253.

Aux deux publications précédentes de la correspondance du Président de Brosses (*Lettres à Charles-Catherine Loppin de Gemeaux*, Paris, Firmin-Didot, et *Lettres familières écrites d'Italie*, *ibid.*) Mlle Bézard ajoute maintenant l'échange de lettres entre le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève: Jacob Huber, Charles Bonnet, Pierre Pictet, et Jean Jallabert. La collection comprend 104 lettres, dont 43 du Président lui-même. La plupart de ces lettres sont conservées à la Bibliothèque publique de Genève et aux Archives du Comte André de Brosses. Autant que j'en puisse juger, la publication a été faite avec beaucoup de soin; l'introduction bien documentée renseigne le lecteur sur les différents correspondants du Président et sur les rapports qu'il avait avec eux. Toutes les informations ne trouvant pas place dans une introduction, sont parsemées dans les multiples notes accompagnant le

texte. L'idée de Mlle Bézard de ne pas présenter les lettres dans leur ordre chronologique, mais de les grouper suivant les différents correspondants, me paraît très heureuse, les sujets que le Président discute variant selon le caractère, les préoccupations et la profession de celui à qui il s'adresse. Il s'entretient d'agriculture et surtout de politique avec J. Huber, de sciences naturelles et de philologie avec Bonnet. (On admirera la délicatesse non moins que l'art avec lequel le Président ménage et critique tout à la fois la vanité d'auteur et le lourd pédantisme de Bonnet.) Les lettres à Jallabert indiquent avec quel soin de Brosses rassemblait les documents sur lesquels il appuyait ses études géographiques et philologiques et quel intérêt il attachait à l'impression et à la publication de ses ouvrages. Jallabert se charge également de renseigner le Président sur toutes les curiosités scientifiques et, last not least, il s'ingénie à le faire bénéficier de la franchise postale. Il est amusant de suivre les artifices employés au dix-huitième siècle par les personnes de haut rang pour déjouer les autorités centrales et évasion des taxes postales. C'est encore Jallabert qui sert d'intermédiaire entre de Brosses d'une part et Voltaire et Rousseau d'autre part (v. dans la lettre du 18 février 1766 le jugement final du Président sur Rousseau).

L'intérêt de la publication de Mlle Bézard se présente sous nombre d'aspects. Nous trouvons d'abord des renseignements importants sur la personnalité du Président et sur ses ouvrages. De Brosses étant un esprit d'une grande culture et d'une vaste curiosité scientifique, et ses amis étant des érudits et des philosophes de premier ordre, la correspondance abonde en discussions intéressantes sur les grands thèmes scientifiques et philosophiques du dix-huitième siècle: questions de biologie, questions de géographie et de colonisation (v. à ce sujet la réponse étonnante du Président à la lettre de Pictet, pp. 138-140), questions épistémologiques et linguistiques, etc. L'échange de lettres avec J. Huber ouvre une perspective curieuse sur Genève comme centre d'informations politiques. C'est de Genève que de Brosses reçoit ses "dernières nouvelles" sur le développement de la Guerre de la succession d'Autriche. Au grand étonnement de Huber le Président, qui pourtant tenait beaucoup à être bien informé, n'était pas encore au courant de la signature de la paix à Aix-la-Chapelle un mois après l'événement.

• Nous n'avons pu souligner que quelques points de cette correspondance qui est d'un grand intérêt pour tous les amateurs et étudiants du dix-huitième siècle.

HERBERT DIECKMANN

Washington University

BRIEF MENTION

The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton. A New Text Edited with Introduction and Notes by HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941. Pp. xiv + 574. \$2.50. "The New Cambridge Edition" of Milton is not Moody rewritten; it is a new book, with new introductions, notes, and text. It owes little to the volume which for forty years was a favorite with students and which, in this reviewer's opinion, is now superseded. Professor Fletcher has wisely not attempted to reword and bring up to date Moody's well turned criticism; instead he has given us his own words, which do justice not only to recent scholarship but also to Milton himself. His book is pleasant to the eye and packed with useful information. Notes are at the bottom of the page (where they should be) and are concisely helpful rather than text-encroaching. Like Moody, Fletcher annotates the Latin verse sparsely. To compensate for such laudable severity there are scattered riches: a neat summary of biographical materials, stimulating views on chronology, commonsense criticism, carefully chosen bibliographical references, and a completely new text. Unlike Moody, Fletcher rightly based his text on the last editions printed by Milton; and unlike all previous editors, he collated many copies of each edition, choosing from all possible variants what seemed to him the correct readings. The result, however, "is not intended to be a basic, completely adequate text with full textual apparatus for scholarly use," and the scholar interested in such matters must wait for the complete text which I believe Professor Fletcher has in preparation. One notices a good many unaccustomed readings, but systematic search for them is made difficult by the editor's decision (in view of the purpose of the book) to modernize spelling, capitalization, and typography, and also by a few errors in proofreading. With the new Cambridge Milton we have come closer than ever before to what Milton probably intended us to read.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

The Ohio State University

Universal Author Repertoire of Italian Essay Literature. By JOSEPH G. FUCILLA. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1941. Pp. 534. This volume is the large answer to the very large question: "What is there on a given author in the thousands of Italian miscellaneous essay volumes which have appeared throughout most of the nineteenth century and our own?" It is a huge undertaking in bibliography which only those perhaps who have wondered at the contents of such announced titles as "Da Dante a Manzoni" or *Studi di poesia* will readily appreciate. Such volumes of course

are very popular on the Italian scene. They quite often contain essays on literature other than Italian. This bibliography, consequently, goes beyond the field of Italian literature. Professor Fucilla has examined the contents of exactly one thousand six hundred and ninety-seven "miscellaneous essay volumes" published from 1821 to 1938. A numbered list of these opens the volume. Then in a second index the contents of these volumes are analyzed according to the authors discussed by the essays—an index containing about eighteen thousand titles. Obviously this is pure bibliography on a vast scale. Professor Fucilla has assumed that scholars want to know of everything written on "their author." He has explored for them a field which they were most likely to overlook. True, they may not care to read the essays which thus come to their attention. They may find them to be inaccessible. But surely, in any case, they cannot fail to be grateful to Professor Fucilla for indicating their existence. It was not his business as bibliographer in this case to choose. His was to list all contents. And this he could not have done in a better or more thorough way.

C. S. S.

Richard Owen Cambridge: Belated Augustan. By RICHARD D. ALTICK. Dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1941. Pp. vi + 160. Unlike many Ph. D. theses, this is a pleasant, thorough, unpretentious piece of work. Mr. Altick has searched widely in published and unpublished material and has brought together a surprising amount of information and anecdote about the author of *The Scribleriad* and of twenty-one papers in *The World*. Yet there is no attempt to make Cambridge an important figure; instead his writings, his kindly personality, and his manner of life are shown to be characteristic of "the cultural lag . . . [of] the latter half of the eighteenth century."

R. D. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

• THE LICENSE FOR SHAKESPEARE'S MARRIAGE. In a note with this title in *MLN* for last June, pp. 450-451, Dr. J. G. McManaway has pointed out an error in my little book, *Shakespeare of Stratford* (p. 3), where I have reprinted the Worcester record of a marriage license between Wm. Shaxpere and "Anne Whateley" in part as follows:

Item eodem die *supradicto* emanavit Licentia . . .

It is all too evident that in giving the fourth word as I did I was following the allegedly precise transcript of the manuscript in the *Shakespeare Documents* (1904) of Mr. D. H. Lambert, who reads

Itē eodem die /sup̄dicto/ emanavit Licētia . . .

This looks careful, and *supradicto* gives a satisfactory, though rather pleonastic, meaning. The trouble is that it cannot possibly be read from the word which appears in the facsimile of the entry published by Mr. J. W. Gray in his *Shakespeare's Marriage* (1905). Why Mr. Lambert so read it, and why I failed to check it by Mr. Gray's facsimile, are questions I blush to consider.

The disputed word seems from the facsimile to be intended for "similis," that is, a *like* license, as the original publisher, Halliwell-Phillipps, and nearly all other scholars have understood it. It is in my judgment clearly written *salis*, with a looped double line above the entire word which would naturally indicate an omitted "m." Dr. McManaway proposes a new interpretation, *salis*, for "salutis," and would translate, "on the same day of salvation a license proceeded." This seems to me much less likely. In the first place, though the phrase "annus salutis" is common enough, as Dr. McManaway says, in formal historical dates (meaning simply "A.D."), that offers no precedent for "dies salutis." Paleographically, the slightly rising horizontal stroke which follows the end of the first "s" in the questioned word, and which Dr. McManaway takes for part of an "a," looks to me like the normal transition-stroke to a quite regular "i." The dot over this "i" is clear, though not conspicuous, in my copy of the facsimile.

It would be foolish to argue the point at length. So far as I know, the only facsimile yet available from the Worcester diocesan register is the one in Gray's book, consisting of a mere line and a half, to which Chambers and Professor B. R. Lewis refer their readers. A glance at the original, or a facsimile of more generous length, would probably show the word occurring repeatedly and make its meaning unquestionably clear.

T. BROOKE

Yale University

REPLY. Professor Tucker Brooke is, of course, correct in his belief that the adjacent entries in the Register of the Bishop of Worcester must eventually be consulted in an attempt to determine the correct reading of the contracted word "salis" or "sitis." Meanwhile, the Register itself not being accessible, we have only the facsimile of the Shakespeare entry published by J. W. Gray.¹

¹ The transcription given by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps may be ignored without great risk, for he is reputed to have been unable to read the secretarial hand and to have been dependent on the accuracy of an assistant. Only he and Gray seem to have examined the Register; reprints of the entry by other scholars appear to be derivative or to be based on Gray's facsimile.

In this facsimile every letter in the crucial word is clear except the second, which I take to be "a" and Professor Brooke reads as "i". There are two points of disagreement. First, is the letter "a" or "i"; and, second, does the horizontal loop over the word represent omitted "ut" or an omitted "m"? It appears to me that the first two letters are "sa," and readers who have the works at hand will wish to compare the word in Gray's facsimile of the marriage entry with the words in the various facsimiles I previously cited in Mr. Hilary Jenkinson's article and book, in which initial "s" and "a" are linked by a descending curve that terminates the "s" and forms part of the body of the "a". The dot to which Professor Brooke refers is so faint that it does not appear to belong to the word in question; it may be a stain or other defect in the paper, but only a careful examination of the original manuscript can decide this point.

The significance of the loop is open to discussion. The normal method of indicating the omission of "m" or "n" is to place a bar or tilde over the adjacent vowel. On the other hand, according to McKerrow, "an l with a cross-mark or curl, i or i, is used to indicate a number of contractions or suspensions, e g ahr = aliter, Hercu^l = Herculis." Among McKerrow's examples of other contracted forms are "aptice = apostolice" and "apto^l = apostolorum,"² but these have been marginally corrected in manuscript by Falconer Madan, whose copy of McKerrow's book is in my possession, so that "aptice = apostolice" and "apto^l = apostolorum." And as I have pointed out in the documents reproduced by Jenkinson, "sa^ltm = salutem." In ten of the documents I cited the l-contraction in "salutem" is indicated by a single bar extending almost the length of the word; in the other one, Plate XXXI. ii, line 1, two intersecting horizontal strokes extend the length of the word, forming the equivalent of the horizontal loop in the marriage entry, which likewise extends from the first letter of the word through the last. Thus there is abundant evidence for interpreting a single or double bar (or a loop) extending the length of a word as the sign of an l-contraction.

Until it is possible, by examination of the original entry and those adjacent to it in the Bishop of Worcester's Register, to determine the scribal habits of the official who kept the Register, I shall continue to believe that the contraction is "satis" and that it should be expanded to "salutis."³

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

Folger Shakespeare Library

² See R. B. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 320, 321, 324.

³ I take this opportunity to correct two literal errors in my original note that were introduced after the proofs left my hands: in paragraph 2, line 2, read "supradicto," and in paragraph 5, line 1, read "salutis."

ENCORE ANC. FR. *Açopart* 'Ethiopien.' En lisant dans *MP.* XXXVIII, 243 seq. l'article de M. Edward C. Armstrong sur l'anc. fr. *Açopart* 'Ethiopien' (j'en dois la connaissance à l'amitié bienveillante de l'auteur), il me vint à l'esprit qu'une étymologie autre que celle proposée par Paul Meyer et acceptée par M. Armstrong aurait quelque chance d'être la bonne. J'avais recueilli quelques notes à ce sujet, et je me proposais d'en faire un court article, quand j'eus la malchance de les perdre, avec d'autres papiers plus ou moins importants. L'article de M. Leo Spitzer dans *MLN.* LVII, 252 seq. me fait penser qu'il ne serait peut-être pas inutile de porter à la connaissance du public mon hypothèse, même dépourvue de références.

En peu de mots, voici de quoi il s'agit. En arabe, les Ethiopiens de religion islamique (et eux seuls, à l'exclusion des Chrétiens) sont connus sous le nom d'*al-Jabart*, *al* représentant bien-entendu l'article. L'origine de ce terme, qui ne s'appliquait d'abord qu'aux habitants de la petite principauté d'Iḥāf dans l'Ethiopie du sud-est et dont l'étymologie est incertaine, a été l'objet de nombreuses recherches, résumées par M. Enrico Cerulli dans un excellent article de l'*Enciclopedia Italiana*, xvi, 931 (1932). Bien que l'*l* de l'article ne s'assimile pas, en arabe littéraire, à un *j* qui le suit, l'assimilation a lieu normalement dans plusieurs dialectes, notamment dans ceux de la Syrie et de la Palestine. Un mot tel qu'*Ajjabart* (le deuxième *a*, très court, a une couleur très peu marquée) a pu être reproduit en français sous la forme *Açopart* ou *Achopart*.

Les troupes éthiopiennes qui combattaient dans l'armée des Ayyoubides en Syrie se composaient naturellement de musulmans. Ce furent sans doute des Arabes qui donnèrent aux Croisés des informations sur ces troupes, et *al-Jabart* était le seul mot par lequel ils auraient pu indiquer le caractère ethnique de ces guerriers étrangers.

L'étymologie arabe d'*Açopart* n'est point atteinte par quatre des cinq objections formulées par M. Spitzer (p. 253) contre l'étymologie qui le fait dériver d'*Aethiops*, plus le suffixe adjectival *-art*. La cinquième objection subsiste. Néanmoins, si M. Spitzer a sans doute raison de protester, après Sainéan, contre "les prétendus orientalismes de l'onomasologie païenne dans les chansons de geste," il me semble qu'il faut se garder de tomber dans l'excès contraire: deux siècles de rapports étroits entre les Croisés et la Syrie (sans parler des relations suivies entre l'Espagne islamique et la France chrétienne) n'ont pu manquer de laisser des traces dans la langue. N'est-il pas vraisemblable que les Croisés, en remarquant parmi leurs adversaires la présence de troupes d'un caractère particulier, se soient adressés aux indigènes de Syrie pour obtenir des renseignements sur ces troupes, et qu'ils aient ainsi adopté le terme arabe?

Mon hypothèse ne présente qu'une difficulté. Le terme *al-Jabart* ne se rencontre en arabe, autant que je sache, qu'à partir du treizième siècle, tandis qu'*Açopart* se trouve déjà dans un texte latin d'Albert d'Aix, du début du douzième. Mais, pour me servir d'une remarque judicieuse de M. Spitzer (p. 255), "rien ne nous empêche d'admettre l'existence, deux ou trois siècles avant son attestation, d'un nom désignant une population étrangère, et pour lequel un témoignage positif pourrait surgir d'un jour

à l'autre d'un texte arabe inédit la littérature arabe du Moyen Âge est loin d'être connue et étudiée aussi complètement que le sont la latine et la française.

Avant de conclure, je voudrais remarquer que la forme et la fortune d'*Açopart* auraient fort bien pu être influencées et favorisées par l'analogie phonétique du verbe *açoper*, *achopper* : une étymologie populaire aurait assimilé les Ethiopiens qui ouvraient la bataille en se tenant à genoux à des personnes qui trébuchent (bien que l'analogie des deux attitudes ne me paraisse pas aussi frappante qu'elle le paraît à M. Spitzer).

Quoi qu'il en soit, ma suggestion présente tout au moins l'avantage de concilier les points de vue de M. Armstrong, qui voit dans *Açopart* un nom propre, et de M. Spitzer, qui le rattache au verbe *achopper*. La politique de l'"apaisement" offre encore quelque utilité . . . dans le domaine de l'étymologie, bien entendu.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA

University of Pennsylvania

ENCORE ET TOUJOURS LES ACHOPARTS (OU DE L'UTILITÉ DU GREC BYZANTIN POUR LES ETUDES ROMANES). J'ai parlé il y a dix ans des Agolans et des Achoparts.¹ On semble ignorer encore aujourd'hui qu'Algolans, Agolans = l'arabe al-ghulâm, gars, garçon, héros

Mais c'est spécialement du mot *Achopart* que la courtoisie du directeur de cette Revue m'invite à entretenir ses lecteurs. Je ne reviens pas sur les étymologies proposées par P. Meyer² et d'autres, notamment sur celle que M. Giorgio Levi Della Vida, le maître arabisant, vient de nous suggérer, dans le même fascicule du savant recueil auquel j'ai l'honneur de collaborer pour la première fois. Cette dernière explication est aussi ingénieuse qu'érudite, et je n'aurais pas "ressuscité" celle que j'enterrai il y a onze ans dans le *Bulletin* de notre Académie,³ si M. Levi Della Vida lui-même ne l'avait trouvée intéressante et même plausible. La voici donc, brièvement.

Dans l'épopée byzantine de Digenis Akritas, dont la rédaction originale ou primitive est sûrement du X^e siècle, on trouve le pluriel *ἀτζουπάδες* (*atzoupádes* ou *adjoupádes*, pluriel de *adjoupás*) pour désigner des esclaves, des chambellans ou des gardes-de-corps. Ainsi le beau-père de Digenis lui fait présent de douze femmes de chambre et de douze *ἀτζουπάδες*.⁴

¹ Voir Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 1931, pp. 481-484.

² *Romania*, VII (1878), 437-440.

³ Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 1931, pp. 463-493.

⁴ *Escorialensis*, vers 1076; *Trébizonde*, Chant V, vers 1397; *Andros*, vers 2261. Hesseling n'a pas compris ce mot; il l'a traduit par "chambrières," et Miliarakis s'est trompé aussi: au vers 2261 d'*Andros*, il a écrit *τζουράρας* au lieu de *ἀτζουπάρας*.

Ce même mot se retrouve dans une partie "tardive" du Digenis—le premier chant de la rédaction d'Andros—qui contient, il est vrai, des éléments archaïques empruntés probablement à des chants perdus de l'ancien poème. De toutes façons, le vers 90 du Chant I d'Andros est très instructif parce qu'il nous montre quelle était la fonction des *ἀτζουπάδες*. Ce sont des huissiers sarrasins chargés de veiller aux portes du palais:

Τριακοσίους Σαρακηνοὺς, γέροντας ἀτζουπάδες

ἔδωκε νὰ φυλάττωσι τριγύρωθεν τὰς πόρτες.

Le mot n'est pas particulier à l'épopée vulgaire. Il est employé par un chroniqueur du X^e siècle (le Continuateur de Théophane), dans un sens qui à première vue paraît exactement pareil. L'Empereur déposé, Romain Lécapène ou Lacapène, devenu moine, a une vision "infernale" conduit tout nu par des eunuques dans une grande salle du Palais, il y voit un grand bûcher attisé par des *atzypades*⁵ (noter la variante vocalique). La Vierge prend pitié de l'Empereur, l'habille et le fait entrer dans une autre salle, tandis que deux grands dignitaires, dont un évêque, sont jetés dans le brasier par les *atzypades*.

Il est clair que les *atzypades*, comme les eunuques, font partie du personnel du palais. Mais quelque chose a dû les recommander au conteur de cette vision pour le rôle de diables ou de diabolins qu'ils y jouent. Le texte cité plus haut de Digenis nous donne la clé du mystère. Les *atzoupades*, ou mieux *atzypades*, devaient être des huissiers ou chambellans d'origine sarrasine ou nègre: depuis longtemps, dans l'hagiographie, le diable apparaissait sous la figure d'un Ethiopien (*Αἰθίοψ*).

Nous sommes heureusement en état de confirmer cette hypothèse d'une manière que des critiques indulgents ont trouvée brillante. Un chroniqueur du XI^e siècle, Skylitzès, copié par Cédrenus,⁶ cite, parmi les assassins de Nicéphore Phokas, un certain Atzypotheodoros, Théodore l'Atzypas, et Zonaras ajoute qu'on l'avait surnommé ainsi à cause de la noirceur de sa peau.⁷

⁵ Theophanes Continuatus, Lib. VI, *De Constantino Porphyrogenetto*, ed. de Bonn, p. 439. "Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ῥωμανὸς ὁρᾷ κατ' ἑναρ δύο εὐνούχους λευκοφοροῦντας, καὶ κρατήσαντες αὐτὸν τῶν χειρῶν ἡγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Τρικύμβαλον ὁλόγουμνον. τὸ δὲ τζικανιστήριον ἦν πεπληρωμένον πυρός, συνεδαβελίζετο δὲ ὑπὸ ἀτζυπάδων πολλῶν. καὶ ὁρᾷ τὴν θεοτόκον ἐλθοῦσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ λαλήσασαν τοῖς εὐνούχοις διὰ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην αὐτοῦ. ἐνδύσασα αὐτὸν ἡ θεοτόκος εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Τροπικὴν. διήλθεν δὲ δεδεμένος ὁ κύρ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ σφαγείς καὶ ὁ μητροπολίτης Ἀναστάσιος Ἡρακλέας, ἀγόμενοι παρὰ ἀτζυπάδων· καὶ παρέδωκαν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐρέβαλον εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐκεῖνο . . ."

⁶ Georgius Cedrenus, ed. de Bonn, p. 375. "... ἦσαν δὲ ὁ πατρικίος Μιχαὴλ ὁ Βούρτζης καὶ Ἀέων ταξιάρχης ὁ Βαλάντιος καὶ τῶν τοῦ Τζιμισκῆ πιστικωτάτων ὁ Ἀτζηποθεόδωρος . . . Ἀτζηποθεόδωρος est la meilleure leçon (v. l'appareil critique).

⁷ Joannes Zonaras, vol. III, ed. de Bonn, pp. 517-518: "... ἦσαν δὲ ὁ Βούρτζης Μιχαὴλ ἑγκοτῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὴν ὀργήν, ὡς εἶρηται, τὴν

Conclusion: au X^e siècle byzantin, le mot *ἀρζυπᾶς*, prononcé aussi *ἀρζουπᾶς*, s'appliquait à un huissier ou chambellan d'origine orientale, à la peau noire: c'était un "domestique nègre" du Palais—évidemment emprunté, comme tant d'usages auliques des IX^e et X^e siècles, au cérémonial des Abbassides de Bagdad et de Samarra. Dans ces conditions—et comme le mot à coup sûr est oriental—il suffit de parcourir les descriptions arabes de ces palais pour en retrouver la forme originale. Lisons par exemple le récit d'Al-Khatīb, décrivant la réception d'une ambassade byzantine à Bagdad, l'an 917.⁸ Au palais même, les ambassadeurs ne trouvèrent pas de soldats, mais 4000 eunuques blancs, 3000 noirs, 7000 hadjibs et 4000 pages noirs. J'ai cité ce texte parce que l'article *Hādhib* de l'Encyclopédie de l'Islam (j'y renvoie pour l'étymologie du mot arabe et son sens original, "huissier," qui défend la porte) insiste surtout sur le haut dignitaire de ce nom. Mais les palais arabes—comme celui de Byzance—contenaient des eunuques et des *hādhibs* en foule.

Comme à Byzance ils étaient le plus souvent des nègres, le mot, pris pour une forme d'Αἰθίοψ, en vint à signifier "nègre" et "diable." Ce dernier sens est le seul qu'*ἀρζουπᾶς* ait en grec moderne, à moins qu'on ne tienne compte de la signification d'"aîgnée" qu'*ἀρζουπᾶς* aurait, paraît-il, dans le dialecte de l'île d'Egine (l'araignée étant noire et diabolique!).⁹

M. Levi Della Vida, dès qu'il a eu connaissance des faits historiques et linguistiques exposés ci-dessus, a reconnu l'identité de *hādhib* et d'*ἀρζυπᾶς*. L'aspirée a disparu en grec. c'est normal. La terminaison *-ās* était constamment ajoutée aux mots masculins tirés de l'arabe: cf. *ἀμνηρᾶς*, cas tout à fait pareil. La variante *ἀρζυπᾶς*—*ἀρζουπᾶς* ne fait point difficulté. Je montrerai ailleurs que le Marsile de la *Chanson de Roland* n'est autre que Al-Mansūr.

Il est clair, selon moi, qu'*Ἀζοpart* ou *Achopart* est un mot arabe passé en français par l'intermédiaire du grec byzantin.

Relisons les passages des historiens des Croisades où ce mot figure. Albert d'Aix comme Tudebode, dans leurs dénombremens, sont tributaires du "folklore" ethnographique plutôt que de la géographie réelle. Le premier énumère les Azoparts pêle-mêle avec les Publicains (c'est-à-dire les Pauliciens, rencontrés par les Croisés en Bulgarie!). Et l'énumération de Tudebode est encore plus fantaisiste, à propos de la bataille d'Ascalon "*Turcorum, Saracenorum et Arabum, Agulanorum (!) et Curtorum, Achupartorum (var. Asupartorum), Azumitorum (!!!) et aliorum paganorum . . .*"

Déjà Paul Meyer concluait: "*Azopart est visiblement un terme de langue vulgaire en usage chez les chrétiens établis en Orient.*"

Il n'avait pas, peut-être, entièrement tort de croire que ce mot, venu (ce qu'il ne savait pas) de l'arabe *hādhib* par le grec *ἀρζυπᾶς*—*ἀρζουπᾶς*, avait

⁸ Ἀλόγιστον καὶ Ἀέων ὁ Ἀβαλάντης καὶ ὁ μετὰ γχροὺς Θεόδωρος, ἐν διὰ τὸ τοῦ εἰδὸς μελάντερον ἐκάλουν Ἀρζυποθεόδωρον, καὶ ἕτεροι δύο."

⁹ A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes* (en russe). tome II, pp. 208-210.

⁹ Je pense que c'est P. Karolides qui, le premier, aperçut l'identité d'*ἀρζυπᾶς*, d'*ἀρζουπᾶς* et de *hādhib*. Cf. l'article *ἀρζουπᾶς*—*ἀρζουπᾶδες* de Sp. Kyriakides, dans la *Μεγάλη Ἑγκυκλοπαίδεια (τοῦ Πυρσοῦ)*.

un certain rapport (pseudétymologique) avec *Alθioψ*. Et peut-être que le nom si pareil des Musulmans d'Ethiopie, dont M. Della Vida s'est si opportunément souvenu, a aidé à populariser—en en précisant encore le sens—le nom truculent qui sonne si bien dans tant de vers épiques.

HENRI GRÉGOIRE

*Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes,
New York City*

RÉPONSE. La brillante étymologie que M. Henri Grégoire a proposée en 1931 pour *Agopart* (j'ai honte de l'avoir ignorée, car l'endroit où il l'avait "enterrée" est toute autre chose qu'un cimetière) m'a semblé attrayante dès qu'il m'en fit part l'été dernier, lorsque j'avais déjà envoyé à *MLN* la note imprimée ci-dessus. Je n'hésiterais pas à l'accueillir et à retirer la mienne, si le mot *arḡovrās* (dont la dérivation de l'arabe *ḥādḡib* ne fait point de doute) se trouvait employé, au moins une fois, dans le sens spécifique de "troupes éthiopiennes," comme *Agoparti* (*Achuparti*, *Asuparti*) l'est chez Albert d'Aix et Tudebode. Mais cela n'est pas le cas dans tous les passages cités par M. Grégoire, *arḡovrās* a gardé sa signification originale d'huissier ou de domestique; noir, si l'on veut, mais non pas nécessairement éthiopien. S'il est vrai qu' *Alθioψ* a pris en grec le sens général de "Nègre," les *Agoparti* des historiens des Croisades paraissent bien être des troupes venues de l'Abyssinie, et non point des nègres quelconques. Ainsi que je l'ai reconnu moi-même, le point faible de l'étymologie que j'ai avancée est que nous ignorons si, à la fin du XII^e siècle, on appliquait déjà le mot *al-Djabart* aux Ethiopiens musulmans, comme on l'a fait plus tard. D'autre part, l'étymologie de M. Grégoire, toute séduisante qu'elle est, ne s'impose pas avec une certitude absolue.

La conclusion de l'intéressant débat auquel MM. Armstrong, Spitzer, Grégoire et moi-même avons pris part est plutôt décourageante: quatre étymologies différentes à propos d'un pauvre mot! Il y a de quoi devenir sceptique sur les résultats des études que nous cultivons.

M. Grégoire est peu enclin à reconnaître chez les historiens des Croisades une connaissance même médiocre de l'ethnologie des Infidèles. Je me permets d'être plus optimiste que lui sur ce point. L'énumération des troupes musulmanes qui prirent part à la bataille d'Ascalon, telle que la donne Tudebode, n'est pas aussi "fantaisiste" que le pense M. Grégoire: à l'exception d' "Agulani," tous les autres ethniques sont corrects et se rapportent à des peuples qui étaient réellement représentés dans l'armée musulmane, les "Curti" étant naturellement des Kourdes et les "Azimiti" des Persans (*Adjami* en arabe).

G. L. D. V.

INDEX

SUBJECTS

Addison

—'s *must writ* 666, The Letters of Joseph — 679.

Akenside, Mark, Two Unpublished Poems by — 626.

American Ballads

Ballads and Songs collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society 479.

American Language

The Growth of American English 394; Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers 396.

American Literature

American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman 212.

American Novel

American Fiction, 1920-1940 212; The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860 305.

Andreas Capellanus, The Art of Courtly Love 315.

Angeriano, G.

German Colin Bucher and — 260.

Ariosto

L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle 234.

Arthurian Romance

Arthur, Dux Bellorum 64.

Athenaeum, *The*, 677

Barnes, Barnabe

—' Use of Geoffrey Fenton's *Historie of Gucciardin* 358.

Barrett, Elizabeth, see Browning, Mrs.

Bartram, John 301

Bartram, William 301.

Baudelaire

• — et la Belle aux cheveux d'or 81.

Bede, Man's Unconquerable Mind.

• Studies of English Writers, from — to A. E. Housman and W. P. Ker 381.

Beowulf

— and Grendel's Mother, two minor parallels from folklore 281.

Boccaccio

John Gower and the *De Genealogia Deorum* 23.

Boswell, Foote and a Friend of —'s 325.

Bradley, Henry

Correspondence of Robert Bridges and —, 1900-1923 232

Breton, Nicholas

—'s *The Hate of Treason* 116.

Bridges, Robert

Correspondence of — and Henry Bradley, 1900-1923 232

Bronte, Charlotte

The —'s Web of Childhood 304.

Bronte, Emily Jane

The —'s Web of Childhood 304; The Complete Poems of — 304.

Brosses, de

Le Président — et ses amis de Genève 684.

Browning, Mrs.

Letters from Elizabeth Barrett to B R Haydon 242.

Bucher, G. C.

— and Girolamo Angeriano 260.

Bunyan, "Muck-Rakers" before — 455.

Burnet, Thomas, "Theory of the Earth" 320.

Butler, Bishop, Moralist and Divine 297.

Byron

A Correction in — Scholarship 465.

Calvert, G. H.

—'s Translations from the German 282.

Cambridge, R. O.: Belated Augustan 687.

Campbell, Thomas

"The Wolf's Long Howl" 123

Carlyle on Contemporary Style 362.

Carols, The Burden in — 16.

Cary, Lucius —, Second Viscount Falkland 389

Castro, Guillén de

La espada y los tiempos de la vida en *Las Mocedades del Cid* 568.

Centlivre, A New Poem by Mrs. — 361.

Chaucer

— and "Arnold of the Newe Toun"

- 31; — Mentions a Book 28; "Dan —" 437; Notes on *Troilus and Criseyde*, iv, 1397-1414 92; Observations on Dante and the *Hous of Fame* 26; The Prioress's Gems 440; Sources and Analogues of —'s *Canterbury Tales* 383; The Summoner's "Psalm of Davit" 655; "That Precious Corpus Madrian" 177; "Thy Gentillesse" in *Wife of Bath's Tale*, D 1159-62 173; "When he his 'papier' soghte" *Canterbury Tales* A-4404 34.
- Cheyne, G.
The Letters of Dr. — to the Countess of Huntingdon 78.
- Clark, see Lewis.
- Cokain's *The Obstinate Lady* and the *Araucana* 57.
- Coleridge
A Note on —'s "Kubla Khan" 108; Shelley and the *Conciones ad Populum* 673.
- Coleridge, Sara.
Coleridge *Fille*, A Biography of — 311.
- Collier, John Payne — and *The Murder of John Brewen* 441.
- Comparative Literature
Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen, und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnet's "Theory of the Earth" 320; A Revolution of European Poetry 322; The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts 489.
- Congreve, William
— the Man: a Biography from New Sources 226; The Première of *The Mourning Bride* 55.
- Conrad
Joseph —, The Making of a Novelist 307; Letters of — to Marguerite Poradowska 1890-1920 233.
- Conti, Princesse de, Pour l'Histoire du *Roman royal* 190.
- Corona 239.
- Cowley, An Unpublished Letter from Abraham — 194.
- Coxe, Four Words in —'s *A Short Treatise of Magicall Sciences* 674.
- Craddock, Charles Egbert (Noailles Murfree) 308.
- Crosnier, Jean 245.
- Daborne, The Source of Robert —'s *The Poor-Mans Comfort* 345.
- Danish
A Book of — Ballads 79.
- Dante
Housman, Dehmel and — 211; Observations on — and the *Hous of Fame* 26; "Per l'altre" *Convivio*, iii, xiv, 15 580.
- Dario, Rubén, in New York 641.
- Davies, The Poems of Sir John — 468.
- Dehmel
Housman, — and Dante 211.
- Descartes
From . Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. Animal Soul in French Letters from — to La Mettrie 681.
- Desportes, Un écho de Guinicelli dans Philippe — 429.
- Diderot
—'s Treatment of the Christian Religion in the *Encyclopédie* 398
- Digby, Kenelm.
—'s "Thuscan Virgil" 284.
- Donne, John
A Concordance to the English Poems of — 291; *Ignatius His Conclave* 468; — and Virginia in 1610 661.
- Dostoyevsky
Alyosha Valkovsky and Prince Myshkin 182.
- Drebbel, A Further Note on —'s Submarine 451.
- Dutch
Dat Dyalogus of twisprake tusschen den wisen coninck Salomon ende Marcolphus 162.
- Dyer, *Grongar Hill*, by John — 481.
- Edwards, Jonathan
The Printed Writings of —, 1703-1758, a Bibliography 230.
- Emerson
American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of — and Whitman 212.
- Encyclopédie*, Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the — 398.
- English
Elizabethan *che vore ye* 'I warrant you' 98; "Dan Chaucer" 437; — *dismal* = O.F. **dism-al* 602; Etymologies of Old French *reechier* and — *rack* 631; Four Words in Coxe's *A Short Treatise . . . of Magicall Sciences* 674;

- Linguistic Studies 123; "Muck-Rakers," before Bunyan 455; Shakespeare's Purgative Drug *cyme* 663; The 'Split' Infinitive and A System of Clauses 394.
- English Drama
The Authorship of Some Nineteenth-Century Plays 466; The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Plays, 321
- English Literature
The Art of Biography in Eighteenth-Century England 386; The Cambridge Bibliography of — 285; The Elizabethan Sermon 469, Fifteenth-Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose 79; Five Studies in Literature 76; Italian Nationalism and English Letters 235; Man's Unconquerable Mind 381; Nineteenth-Century Studies 159.
- English Novel
Darwinism in the —, 1860-1910 323; Some Studies in the Modern Novel 243
- English Poetry
The Divine Science the Aesthetic of Some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets 241; The English Ode from Milton to Keats 158; The Oxford Book of Christian Verse 78; Paeonic Measures in English Verse 336.
- Ercilla y Zúñiga
Cokain's *The Obstinate Lady* and the *Araucana* 57.
- Falkland, Lucius Cary, Second Viscount — 389.
- Farrington, John
An Early Manuscript Translation of Rousseau's Second *Discours* 271.
- Fenton, Barnabe Barnes' Use of Geoffrey —'s *Histoire of Gucciardin* 358.
- Fielding and "the First Gothic Revival" 671.
- Folklore, Beowulf and Grendel's Mother, Two Minor Parallels from — 281.
- Foot and a Friend of Boswell's: a Note on *The Nabob* 325.
- France, A.
An Unpublished Letter of Ernest Renan 275.
- French
The Beginnings of — Fixed Word Order 546; *chez Vandamme sont venus* 103; — *mutant* 'the middle,' 'the half' 356.
- French Drama
Ludos Scenicos in Giraldus 188; Un Recueil de farces inédites au XV^e siècle 520; Slanderous Comedies at the University of Orleans in 1447 185; The Theatre of the Basoche 317
- French Literature
Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois 318; Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University 154; Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615 476.
- Gálvez de Montalvo
Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and —'s *El Pastor de Filida* 35
- Gay, John, Favorite of the Wits 300.
- German
— Lexicography 163; *ower Kopp un Wunnen* 264.
- German Drama
Fifty Years of — 242.
- German Folk-Songs
Deutsche Volksheder mit ihren Melodien 77.
- German Literature
Les Beaux Esprits se rencontrent 195; The Classical Ideal in — 80; *Corona* 239; Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600 161, G. H. Calvert's Translations from the German 282.
- Geste des Loherains*
The Connections of the — with Other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres 236.
- Gide, A., et les Problèmes d'influence en littérature 558.
- Giraldus Cambrensis
Ludos Scenicos in — 188.
- Goethe
— Historien littéraire 500; —s Rede zum Shakespears Tag 80; Kaulbach's Illustrated Edition of —'s *Reineke Fuchs*, 1846 59; Wort-index zu —s *Faust* 288, 483.
- Goldoni
— in Spain 683.
- Goldsmith and the Pickle-Shop 121.

Gothic

The Formation of . . . — *widuwarna* 432.

Gould, Robert —, Seventeenth Century Satirist 469.

Gower

John — and the *De Genealogia Deorum* 23.

Gray

An Echo of *L'Allegro* in —'s Bard 676; — and Christopher Smart 360; —'s Opinion of Parnell 675.

Greek, Modern

Some Sandhi Phenomena in — 39.

Guarini

Kenelm Digby's "Thuscan Virgil" 284.

Guicciardini: Barnabe Barnes' Use of Geoffrey Fenton's *Historie of Guicciardin* 358.

Guinicelli, Un écho de — dans Philippe Desportes 429.

Hallam

When Did Tennyson Meet —? 209.

Hartmann von Ouwe, *Der arme Heinrich*, a Poem by — 406.

Hawthorne as Editor 402.

Hazlitt, Outwitting — 459.

Hegel's Hellenic Ideal 310.

Hewlett, Maurice: Historical Roman-cancer 324.

Housman, A. E.

A Bibliography of — 293; A Concordance to the Poems of — 293; —, Dehmel and Dante 211; Man's Unconquerable Mind, Studies of English Writers, from Bede to A. E. — and W. P. Ker 381.

Hugo's *Bancroft* and *Le Message de Grant* 648.

Hume, David

La Première Relation intellectuelle de — en France: une conjecture 268.

Italian

Bibliography of. — Linguistics 400; The — Language 148.

Italian Literature

Universal Author Repertoire of Italian Essay Literature 686.

Italian Nationalism and English Letters 235.

Irish Literature

Eiré, *Histoire d'Irlande* 79.

Irving, Washington

Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle 212.

Johnson, Samuel

Les Dangers du cliché littéraire: Le Dr — et Jean-Jacques Rousseau 573, The Prose Style of — 481.

Jonson, Ben

A Further Note on Drebbel's Submarine 451; The Language of Satirized Characters in *Poetaster* 392, Unity of Time in *Everyman in his Humor* and *Cynthia's Revels* 445.

Jouffroy

Sainte-Beuve on Science and Human Nature —, Le Play, Proudhon 592.

Judd, Sylvester (1813-1853), Novelist of Transcendentalism 309.

Kaulbach's Illustrated Edition of Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*, 1846 59.

Keats

The English Ode from Milton to — 158; "The Eve of St. Agnes" and "The Legend of Britomartis" 463.

Ker, Man's Unconquerable Mind. Studies of English Writers, from Bede to A. E. Housman and W. P. — 381.

Kleist

—'s "Erfindung" 278; —'s Unsichtbares Theater 457

La Mettrie From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to — 681.

Lanier, Sidney: Poet and Prosodist 212.

Latin

An Early — Debate of the Body and Soul 217.

Lawman, see Layamon.

Layamon's *Brut*, *Gernemuðe*: a Place-Name Puzzle in — 179.

Lay of the Beach, Norman History in the — 11.

Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus 74.

Lévesque de Pouilly

La Première Relation intellectuelle de David Hume en France: une conjecture 268.

Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers 396.

Lorscher Bienensegens, *Der Eingang des —* 62.

Luzel, Renan et — 482.

- Lyttelton, The Good Lord —: A Study in Eighteenth Century Politics and Culture 298
- Machiavelli**
— and the Spirit of Comedy 585;
The Prince and Other Works 478.
- Marlowe, Some Nashe Marginalia Concerning — 45
- Martínez de Toledo, Alfonso, *El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho* 313.
- Mazzuchelli, Voltaire to — 355.
- Mérimee, A Note on —'s Correspondence 198.
- Milton
The Complete Poetical Works of John — 686; An Echo of *L'Allegro* in Gray's *Bard* 676; The English Ode from — to Keats 158; An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John — 405; —'s Contemporary Reputation 403; *Paradise Lost* an Account of Its Growth and Major Origins 295; Two New Manuscript Versions of —'s Hobson Poems 192.
- Murk, John, on Bonfires, Elephants and Dragons 113.
- Molière
Sur le sens des titres de quelques comédies de — 407.
- Montaigne
— and Democracy 81; *La Démocratie* de — 82.
- Murder of John Breven*, John Payne Collier and *The* 441.
- Murfree, Noailles, see Craddock.
- Nashe, Some — Marginalia Concerning Marlowe** 45
- Nibelungenlied*, The Study of the — 321.
- Norman History in the "Lay of the Beach" 11.
- Old English**
The Formation of . . . *niwerne* 432, Word-Board 156.
- Old French**
Agopart 252, 485, 486, 690, 691, 694; — *Le chief d'une montagne* 496; Eng. *dismal* = — **dism-al* 602; Etymologies of — *reechier* and English *rack* 631
- Old High German
The Formation of — *diorna* 432.
- Old Irish
The Quarrel between Finn and Oisín 434
- Old Saxon
The Formation of . . . — *thiorna* 432, An — Ghost-Word 639.
- Pascal**
Notes sur une Pensee de — 510; — and the Medieval Definition of God 552
- Persian Poetry, Tennyson and — 83
- Piloust
Pour l'Histoire du *Roman royal* 190
- Piozzi, Hester Lynch — (Mrs. Thrale) 390
- Poe
—, Critic of Voltaire 273, *Tamurlane* and Other Poems 244; The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander — 385.
- Prior, Matthew —'s Funeral 341.
- Provençal
Anthology of the — Troubadours 316; The Distant Love of Jaufré Rudel 528, Father and Son in — Poetry 534
- Renan**
— et Luzel 482; An Unpublished Letter of Ernest — 275.
- Richardson, Samuel, The Text of Edward Young's Letters to — 668.
- Rilke
— — Rodin A Correction 9; —'s Opening Lines 1.
- Rousseau, J.-B., An Unpublished Letter from — to d'Argental 652.
- Rousseau, J.-J., Les Dangers du cliché littéraire: Le Dr. Johnson et — 573; —, Second *Discours* 271.
- Rudel, Jaufré 528.
- Ruskin
The Reception of *Modern Painters* 621
- Sackville, Charles, sixth Earl of Dorset, patron and poet of the Restoration 302.
- Sainte-Beuve on Science and Human Nature: Jouffroy, Le Play, Proudhon 592.
- Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and Gálvez de Montalvo's *El Pastor de Fátida* 35
- Saturday Review*, *The*, 1855-1868 677.
- Seneca, Our 228.

Shakespeare

The 'Bad' Quarto of *Hamlet*: a Critical Study 223; The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays 468; Divine Vengeance 469, The Exchange of Weapons in *Hamlet* 50, The Fencing Actor-Lines in —'s Plays 615; Goethes Rede zum — Tag 80; The License for —'s Marriage 450, 687, 688; *The Passionate Pilgrim* 378; Repetition in —'s Plays 468; *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth* 373; — and Democracy 376; The — Documents 364, —'s Purgative Drug *cyme* 663; The Use of Rhyme in —'s Plays 379

Shelley

— 221; — and the *Conciones ad Populum* 673

Shenstone, William, Letters of — 68. Sidney, A Poem Wrongly Attributed to — 364

Skelton, John, Laureate 72.

Smart, Gray and Christopher — 360. Spanish

La Palabra "titere" 505; "Pozos de nieve" 541; The Use of *a* as a Designation of the Personal Accusative in — 421

Spenser

"The Eve of St Agnes" and "The Legend of Britomartis" 463; — and the "Cinq Points en Amours" 657

Standar ljoš, see *Lay of the Beach*.

Sterling, John: a Representative Victorian 386.

Temple, Sir William

—, The Man and His Work; —: Three Essays 219

Tennyson

— and Persian Poetry 83; When did — meet Hallam? 209

Thrale, Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. —) 390

Tournour

The Ascription of Speeches in *The Revenger's Tragedy* 119.

Tupper, Martin F., and the Victorian Middle Class Mind 677.

Turberville, The Life and Works of George — 468.

Turgenev in England and America 404.

Villon, Five Notes on the Text of — 526.

Voltaire

Le Patriot insulaire 354; Poe, Critic of — 273, Political Elements in Criticism of — in England 1732-47 348; — and Madame du Châtelet: an Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey 238; — to Mazzuchelli 355.

Wellesley, Dorothy, Letters on Poetry from W. B. Yeats to — 312.

Whitman

American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and — 212

Wordsworth

The Mind of a Poet 473.

Yeats, W. B., Letters on Poetry from — to Dorothy Wellesley 312. Young, Edward, The text of —'s Letters to Samuel Richardson 668.

Zola

L'Attaque du moulin in American Translation 207; —'s *la Joie de vivre* and *la Mort d'Olivier Bécaille* 205

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

Adams, P. G., Poe, Critic of Voltaire 273.

Allen, N. B., A Note on Coleridge's "Kubla Khan" 108.

Alonso, A., The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts 489.

Aitick, R. D., Richard Owen Cambridge: Belated Augustan 687.

Armstrong, E. C., Old-French *Le chief d'une montagne* 496; Yet Again the *Agoparts* 485.

Avery, E. L., The Première of *The Mourning Bride* 55

Bacon, W. A., The Source of Robert Daborne's *The Poor-Mans Comfort* 345.

- Bald, R. C. (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Studies* 159.
- Baldensperger, F., *Goethe Historien littéraire* 500; *La première relation intellectuelle de David Hume en France* 268
- Barker, J. E., *Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the Encyclopédie* 398
- Bateson, F. W. (ed.), *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* 285
- Beach, J. W., *American Fiction, 1920-1940* 212
- Beall, C. B., *Un écho de Guinicelli dans Philippe Desportes* 429; *Housman, Dehmel and Dante* 211; *Kenelm Digby's "Thuscan Virgil"* 284.
- Belden, H. M. (ed.), *Ballads and Songs collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society* 479.
- Bell, H. J., Jr., *Goldsmith and the Pickle-Shop* 121.
- Bentley, G. E., *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* 321.
- Berend, E., *Les Beaux Esprits se rencontrent* 195.
- Bergin, T. G., *Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours* 316.
- Beutler, E. (ed.), *Goethes Rede zum Shakespeares Tag* 80.
- Bevington, M. M., *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England* 677.
- Bézar, Y., *Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève* 684.
- Blenner-Hassett, R., *Gernemuße: a Place-Name Puzzle in Lawman's Brut* 179; "When he his 'papier' soghte" *Canterbury Tales* A-4404 34.
- Bostock, J. K. (ed.), *Der arme Heinrich, a Poem by Hartmann von Ouwe* 406.
- Botting, R. B., *Gray and Christopher Smart* 360.
- Bowman, R. K., *The Connections of the Geste des Loherains with Other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres* 236.
- Boys, R. C. (ed.), *Grongar Hill, by John Dyer* 481; *A New Poem by Mrs. Centlivre* 361
- Brockway, P. J., *Sylvester Judd (1813-1853), Novelist of Transcendentalism* 309.
- Brodeur, C. G., *Arthur, Dux Bellorum* 64
- Bronson, B. H., *Five Studies in Literature* 76.
- Brooke, T., *The License for Shakespeare's Marriage* 687
- Brown, H. R., *The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860* 305.
- Bryan, W. F. (ed.), *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* 383.
- Buchmann, R., *Martin F. Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind* 677.
- Butt, J. (ed.), *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. Vol. IV* 385.
- Caldwell, J. R., *Five Studies in Literature* 76
- Cameron, K. N., *Shelley and the Conciones ad Populum* 673.
- Castro, A., *La palabra "titere"* 505.
- Cecil, Lord David (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Christian Verse* 78.
- Chambers, R. W., *Man's Unconquerable Mind* 381.
- Chinard, G., *Notes sur une Pensée de Pascal* 510.
- Cioranescu, A., *L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* 234; *Pour l'Histoire du Roman royal* 190.
- Clifford, J. L., *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs Thrale)* 390.
- Cline, J. M., *Five Studies in Literature* 76.
- Coffin, C. M. (ed.), *Ignatius His Conclave, by John Donne* 468.
- Cohen, G., *Un Recueil de farces inédites du XV^e siècle* 520.
- Combs, H. C., *A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne* 291.
- Cons, L., *Five Notes on the Text of Villon* 526.
- Cooper, Harold, *John Donne and Virginia in 1610* 661.
- Coulson, E. R., see Webb, R.
- Craig, H. S., Jr., *An Unpublished Letter of Ernest Renan* 275.
- Craigie, W. A., *The Growth of American English* 394.
- Criswell, E. H., *Lewis and Clark: Linguistic Pioneers* 396.
- Cronin, G., Jr., *John Mirk on Bonfires, Elephants and Dragons* 113.

- Davis, Herbert (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Studies* 159
- Davis, R. M., *The Good Lord Lyttelton* 298
- Della Vida, G. L., *Encore Anc. Fr. Açopart 'Ethiopien'* 690; *Réponse* 694.
- Dempster, G. (ed.), *Sources and Analogues of 'Chaucer's Canterbury Tales'* 383; "Thy Gentillesse" in *Wife of Bath's Tale*, D 1159-62 173.
- De Vane, W. C. (ed.), *Nineteenth-Century Studies* 159.
- Dilts, D. A., *John Gower and the De Genealogia Deorum* 23; *Observations on Dante and the House of Fame* 26.
- Dolk, Lester, *The Reception of Modern Painters* 621
- Duffy, C., "The Wolf's Long Howl" 123.
- Duncan, E. H., *Chaucer and "Arnold of the Newe Toun"* 31.
- Duthie, G. I., *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet. a Critical Study* 223.
- Earnest, E., *John and William Bartram, Botanists and Explorers* 301.
- Echols, J. M., *An Old Saxon Ghost-Word* 639.
- Ehrsam, T. G., *A Bibliography of A. E. Housman* 293.
- Eliason, N. E., *Shakespeare's Purgative Drug cyme* 663.
- Emery, C., *A Further Note on Drebbel's Submarine* 451.
- Evans, G. B., *Two New Manuscript Versions of Milton's Hobson Poems* 192.
- Ewing, M., *The Authorship of Some Nineteenth-Century Plays* 466.
- Fay, E. G., *Rubén Darío in New York* 641.
- Fellheimer, Jeannette, *Barnabe Barnes' Use of Geoffrey Fenton's Historie of Guicciardin* 358.
- Feuillerat, A., *Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or* 81; *Renan et Luzel* 482; (ed.), *Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University* 154.
- Fielden, F. J. (ed.), *Sir William Temple: Three Essays* 219.
- Fletcher, H. F. (ed.), *The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton* 686.
- Fogle, F. R., *An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton* 405.
- Françon, M., *La Démocratie de Montaigne* 82.
- Frank, Grace, *The Distant Love of Jaufré Rudel* 528; *Voltaire to Mazzuchelli* 355.
- Frost, G. L., "That Precious Corpus Madrian" 177.
- Fucilla, J. G., *Sannazaro's Arcadia and Gálvez de Montalvo's El Pastor de Filida* 35; *Universal Author Repertoire of Italian Essay Literature* 686.
- Furst, N., *Kleist's "Erfindung"* 278; *Kleist's "Unsichtbares Theater"* 457.
- Garnier, C. M., *Eiré, Histoire d'Irlande* 79.
- Gee, J. A. and Sturm, P. J. (trs. and eds.): *Letters of Joseph Conrad to Marguerite Poradowska 1890-1920* 233.
- Gettmann, R. A., *Turgenev in England and America* 404.
- Ghiselin, Brewster, *Paeonic Measures in English Verse* 336.
- Gilbert, A. H. (ed. and tr.), *Machiavelli, The Prince and Other Works* 478; *A Poem Wrongly Attributed to Sidney* 364.
- Gordan, J. D., *Joseph Conrad, The Making of a Novelist* 307.
- Gorrell, R. M., *John Payne Collier and The Murder of John Brewen* 441.
- Graham, W. (ed.), *The Letters of Joseph Addison* 679.
- Gray, Glenn, *Hegel's Hellenic Ideal*, 310
- Grégoire, H., *Encore et toujours les Achoparts* 691.
- Griggs, E. L., *Coleridge Fille, a Biography of Sara Coleridge* 311.
- Hagge, C. W., *G. H. Calvert's Translations from the German* 282.
- Hall, R. A., Jr., *Bibliography of Italian Linguistics* 400.
- Haller, Elisabeth, *Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen, und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnet's "Theory of the Earth"* 320.
- Hamilton, M. P., *The Summoner's "Psalm of David"* 655.

- Hankins, J. E., The Character of Hamlet and Other Essays; The Life and Works of George Turberville 468
- Harris, B., Charles Sackville, sixth Earl of Dorset 302
- Harvey, H. G., The Theatre of the Bazoche The Contribution of the Law Societies to French Mediaeval Comedy 317
- Hatcher, A. G., The Use of *a* as a Designation of the Personal Accusative in Spanish 421.
- Hatfield, C. W., The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Bronte 304.
- Havens, R. D., The Mind of a Poet: a Study of Wordsworth's Thought with Particular Reference to "The Prelude" 473.
- Healy, D. M., A Note on Mémée's Correspondence 198
- Heilman, R. B., Fielding and "the First Gothic Revival" 671.
- Heningham, E. K. (ed.), An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul, Preserved in MS Royal 7 A III in the British Museum 217.
- Henkin, L. J., Darwinism in the English Novel, 1860-1910 323.
- Herr, A. F., The Elizabethan Sermon 469.
- Hill, R. T., Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours 316
- Hoare, D. M., Some Studies in the Modern Novel 243
- Hodges, J. C., William Congreve the Man: a Biography from New Sources 226
- Hohlfeld, A. R., Wortindex zu Goethes *Faust* 288, 483.
- Holmes, U. T., Jr., *Ludos Scenicos* in Giraldus 188.
- Howard, C. (ed.), The Poems of Sir John Davies 468
- Howard, E. J., Four Words in Coxe's *A Short Treatise . . . of Magicall Sciences* 674.
- Hull, V., The Quarrel between Finn and Oisín 434.
- Hutton, J., Germain Colin Bucher and Girolamo Angeriano 260; Spenser and the "Cinq Points en Amours" 657
- Hyder, C. K., A Concordance to the Poems of A. E. Housman 293,
- Irving, W. H., John Gay, Favorite of the Wits 300.
- Jackson, J. L., The Exchange of Weapons in *Hamlet* 50; The Fencing Actor-Lines in Shakespeare's Plays 615.
- Jespersen, O., The 'Split Infinitive' and A System of Clauses 394.
- Johnson, T. H., The Printed Writings of Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, a Bibliography 230
- Jonas, L., The Divine Science: the Aesthetic of Some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets 241
- Jones, M. B., *L'Attaque du moulin* in American Translation 207.
- Joos, Martin, Wortindex zu Goethes *Faust* 288.
- Kahane, Renée T., Some Sandhi Phenomena in Modern Greek 39.
- Kallich, M., Unity of Time in *Every Man in his Humor* and *Cynthia's Revels* 445.
- Keating, L. C., Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615 476
- King, A. H., The Language of Satirized Characters in *Poetaster* 392.
- Kocher, P. H., Some Nashe Marginalia Concerning Marlowe 45.
- Kokeritz, H., Elizabethan *che vore ye* 'I warrant you' 98.
- Kreider, P. V., Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays 468.
- Kurrelmeyer, W., German Lexicography. Part VIII 163; Kaulbach's Illustrated Edition of Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*, 1846 59
- Law, R. A., "Muck-Rakers" before Bunyan 455.
- Lewent, K., Father and Son in Provençal Poetry 534.
- Lewis, B. R. (ed.), The Shakespeare Documents, Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations and Commentary 364
- Livingston, C. H., Etymologies of Old French *reechier* and English *rack* 631.
- Lynch, J. J., The Prioress's Gems 440.
- Mabbott, T. O. (ed.), A Bostonian [Poet], *Tamerlane* and Other Poems 244.
- McColley, G., *Paradise Lost*: An

- Account of Its Growth and Major Origins 295
- McKenzie, G., Five Studies in Literature 76.
- McManaway, J. G., The License for Shakespeare's Marriage 450; Reply 688.
- Magoun, F. P., Jr., Norman History in the "Lay of the Beach" (*Strandar lyoð*) 11.
- Mallam, Duncan, (ed.), Letters of William Shenstone 68.
- Malone, K., Some Linguistic Studies of 1939 and 1940 123.
- Manning, C. A., Alyosha Valkovsky and Prince Myshkin 182.
- Marchand, L. A., *The Athenaeum: a Mirror of Victorian Culture* 677.
- Marion, S., Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois 318.
- Mathews, E. G., Cokam's *The Obstinate Lady* and the *Araucana* 57
- Matthiessen, F. O., American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman 212
- Mendell, C. W., Our Seneca 228.
- Metzger, F., The Formation of Old High German *diorna*, Old Saxon *thiorna*, Gothic *widunearna*, and Old English *niwerne* 432
- Morley, S. G., "Pozos de nieve" 541.
- Morris, R. L., Addison's *miat wit* 666.
- Motter, T. H. V., When Did Tennyson Meet Hallam? 209
- Mroz, M. B., Divine Vengeance 469
- Muller, H. F., The Beginnings of French Fixed Word Order 546.
- Mullett, C. F. (ed.), The Letters of Dr. George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon 78.
- Neff, E., A Revolution in European Poetry 322.
- Nelson, William, John Skelton, Laureate 72.
- Ness, F. W., The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays 379.
- Niess, R. J., Zola's *la Jone de vivre* and *la Mort d'Olivier Bécaille* 205.
- Nitze, W. A., Pascal and the Medieval Definition of God 552.
- Norton, W. J., Jr., Bishop Butler, Moralist and Divine 297.
- Oake, R. B., Political Elements in Criticism of Voltaire in England 1732-47 348.
- Olrik, A. (ed.), A Book of Danish Ballads 79.
- Parker, W. R., Milton's Contemporary Reputation 403.
- Parks, E. W., Charles Egbert Craddock (Noailles Murfree) 308.
- Parry, J. J., The Art of Courtly Love By Andreas Capellanus 315.
- Patterson, F. A., An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton 405.
- Paulsen, W. (ed.), *Corona* 239.
- Pei, Mario, The Italian Language 148
- Peters, H. F., Rilke—Rodin: A Correction 9.
- Pettit, Henry, The Text of Edward Young's Letters to Samuel Richardson 668.
- Peyre, H., André Gide et les Problèmes d'influence en littérature 558.
- Pike, R. E., Voltaire *Le Patriot insulaire* 354
- Pyles T., "Dan Chaucer" 437.
- Quynn, D. M. and Snellgrove, H. S., Slandorous Comedies at the University of Orleans in 1447 185.
- Rabinovitz, A. L., Hugo's *Bancroft* and *Le Message de Grant* 648.
- Ratchford, F. E., The Brontës' Web of Childhood 304.
- Robbins, R. H., The Burden in Carols 16.
- Roberts, R. P. ap, Notes on *Troilus and Criseyde*, IV, 1397-1414 92.
- Robertson, Jean, Nicholas Breton's *The Hate of Treason* 116.
- Rogers, P. P., Goldoni in Spain 683.
- Rollins, H. E. (ed.), *The Passionate Pilgrim* by William Shakespeare, 378
- Rosenfield, L. C., From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine, Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to La Mettrie 681.
- Ross, J. F., Five Studies in Literature 76.
- Rubin, J. J., Carlyle on, Contemporary Style 362.
- Rudman, H., Italian Nationalism and English Letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian men of letters 235.

- Salinas, P., La espada y los tiempos de la vida en *Las Mocedades del Cid* 568; Truth of Two and Other Poems 401.
- Salinger, H., Rilke's Opening Lines 1
- Scherer, J., Sur le sens des titres de quelques comédies de Molière 407
- Schinz, A., Les Dangers du cliché littéraire. Le Dr Johnson et Jean-Jacques Rousseau 573.
- Schirokauer, A., Der Eingang des Lorscheer Bienensegens 62, *over Kopp un Wunnen* 264; (ed.) *Corona* 239.
- Schmitz, F. J., Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus 74
- Sewall, R. B., An Early Manuscript Translation of Rousseau's Second Discours 271.
- Shaaber, M. A. (ed.), *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth* 373
- Shackford, M. H. (ed.), Letters from Elizabeth Barrett to B. R. Haydon 242
- Shaw, J. E., "Per l'altre" *Convivio* III, xiv, 15 580
- Shuster, G. N., The English Ode from Milton to Keats 158
- Simmons, J., An Unpublished Letter from Abraham Cowley 194
- Simpson, L. B. (ed.), *El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho* de Alfonso Martinez de Toledo 313.
- Singleton, C. S., Machiavelli and the Spirit of Comedy 585.
- Sloane, E. H., Robert Gould, Seventeenth Century Satirist 469.
- Smith, Horatio, Sainte-Beuve on Science and Human Nature: Jouffroy, Le Play, Proudhon 592
- Smith-Dampier, E. M. (tr.), A Book of Danish Ballads 79.
- Snellgrove, H. S., see Quynn, D. M.
- Spitzer, L., Anc fr *Agopart* 'Ethiopien' 252; *chez Vandamme sont venus* 103; Eng *dismal* = O. F. **dism-al* 602; Fr *mutant* 'the Middle,' 'the Half' 356; Reply 486
- Starr, H. W., An Echo of *L'Allegro* in Gray's *Bard* 676; Gray's Opinion of Parnell 675.
- Stauffer, D. A., The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England 386.
- Stearns, M. W., Chaucer Mentions a Book 28.
- Sturm, P. J., see Gee, J. A.
- Sullens, Z. R., A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne 291.
- Sutherland, A. B., Maurice Hewlett: Historical Romancer 324.
- Thaler, A., Shakespeare and Democracy 376
- Thomas, R. H., The Classical Ideal in German Literature 80.
- Thorp, M., The Study of the Nibelungenlied 321
- Tillotson, G. (ed.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope Vol II. 385.
- Torrey, N. L., Montaigne and Democracy 81.
- Tuell, A. K., John Sterling. a Representative Victorian 386.
- Turnbull, E. L. (tr.), *Truth of Two* and Other Poems 401.
- Turner, Arlin (ed.), Hawthorne as Editor 402
- Twaddell, W. F., Wortindex zu Goethes *Faust* 288.
- Vreese, W. de, and de Vries, Jan (eds.), *Das Dyalogus of twisprake tuschen den wisen coninck Salomon ende Marcolphus* 162
- Vries, Jan de, see Vreese, W. de.
- Wade, I. O., Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet: an Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey 238.
- Waith, E. M., The Ascription of Speeches in *The Revenger's Tragedy* 119.
- Wardle, R. M., Outwitting Hazlitt 459.
- Webb, R. and Coulson, E. R., Sidney Lanier Poet and Prosodist 212.
- Weber, K., Lucius Cary 389.
- Wellesley, Dorothy (ed.), Letters on Poetry from W. B. Yeats to — 312.
- Wells, M. E., "The Eve of St. Agnes" and "The Legend of Britomartis" 463.
- Whallon, A. J., Jr, An Unpublished Letter from Jean-Baptiste Rousseau to d'Argental 652
- Whitbread, L., Beowulf and Grendel's Mother 281.
- White, N. L., Shelley 221.
- Wiem, Irene, Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600 161.
- Wiener, H. S. L., A Correction in Byron Scholarship 465

- Williams, Margaret (tr. and ed.), Word-Hoard 156.
 Williams, Marjorie, (ed.), The Letters of William Shenstone 68.
 Williams, Ralph M., Two Unpublished Poems by Mark Akenside 626.
 Williams, Stanley (ed.): Washington Irving, *Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle* 212.
 Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., Foote and a Friend of Boswell's 325, The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson 481.
 Woodbridge, H. E., Sir William Temple, The Man and His Work 219.
 Workman, S. K., Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence in English Prose 79.
 Wright, H. B., Matthew Prior's Funeral 341.
 Yohannan, J. D., Tennyson and Persian poetry 83.
 Zdanowicz, C. D., Jean Crosnier 245.

REVIEWERS

- Anderson, C. R.: J. W. Beach, American Fiction, 1920-1940; F. O. Matthiessen, American Renaissance; R. Webb and E. R. Coulson, Sidney Lanier; S. Williams (ed.), W. Irving, *Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle* 212.
 Bald, R. C.: E. L. Griggs, Coleridge *File* 311.
 Baldwin, T. W.: B. R. Lewis (ed.), The Shakespeare Documents 364.
 Bartlett, P. B.: K. Weber, Lucius Cary 389.
 Beach, J. W.: R. D. Havens, The Mind of a Poet 473.
 Beall, C. B.: Al. Cioranescu, L'Arioste en France des origines à la fin du XVIII^e siècle 234.
 Blanchard, Rae: W. Graham (ed.), The Letters of Joseph Addison 679.
 Bowers, F.: P. V. Kreider, Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays; J. E. Hankins, The Character of Hamlet; The Life and Works of George Turberville; C. Howard (ed.), The Poems of Sir John Davies; C. M. Coffin (ed.), *Ignatius His Conclave*, by John Donne; M. B. Mroz, Divine Vengeance; A. F. Herr, The Elizabethan Sermon; E. H. Sloane, Robert Gould 468-9.
 Bradner, L.: F. E. Ratchford, The Brontës' Web of Childhood; C. W. Hatfield, The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë 304.
 Brinkley, R. F.: Leah Jonas, The Divine Science: the Aesthetic of Some Representative Seventeenth-Century English Poets 241.
 Brooke, T.: H. E. Rollins (ed.), *The Passionate Pilgrim* by William Shakespeare 378.
 Brooks, Cleanth Letters on Poetry from W. B. Yeats to Dorothy Wellesley 312.
 Broughton, L. N.: F. W. Bateson (ed.), The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature 285.
 Bryan, W. F. R. W. Chambers, Man's Unconquerable Mind 381.
 Castillo, C.: P. Salinas, *Truth of Two* and Other Poems 401.
 Cooper, Lane: Combs and Sullens, A Concordance to the English Poems of John Donne 291; E. Earnest, John and William Bartram 301.
 Croll, M. W.: Bronson, Caldwell, Cline, McKenzie, Ross, Five Studies in Literature 76; Elisabeth Haller, Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen, und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnet's "Theory of the Earth" 320; W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson 481.
 De Vane, W. C.: M. H. Shackford (ed.), Letters from Elizabeth Barrett to B. R. Haydon 242.
 Dieckmann, H.: Y. Bézard, Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève 684.
 Diekhoff, J. S.: W. R. Parker, Milton's Contemporary Reputation 403.
 Doran, M.: M. A. Shaaber (ed.), *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth* 373.

- Draper, J. W.: F. W. Ness, The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays, 379
- Dunn, W^{*} H. D. A. Stauffer, The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England, A. K. Tuell, John Sterling 386.
- Edwards, Bateman: R. K. Bowman, The Connections of the *Geste des Loherdins* with Other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres 236.
- Eliason, N. E. W. A. Craigie, The Growth of American English 394; E. H. Criswell, Lewis and Clark. Linguistic Pioneers 396; O. Jespersen, The 'Split Infinitive' and A System of Clauses 394, A. H. King, The Language of Satirized Characters in *Poetaster* 392.
- Eves, C. K.: W. H. Irving, John Gay, 300
- Fairchild, H. N.: Lord David Cecil, The Oxford Book of Christian Verse 78, C. F. Mullett, The Letters of Dr George Cheyne to the Countess of Huntingdon 78
- Feise, E. E. Beutler (ed.), Goethes Rede zwm Shakespears Tag 80; R. H. Thomas, The Classical Ideal in German Literature 80.
- French, J. C. T. O. Mabbott (ed.), a Bostonian [Poe], *Tamerlane* and Other Poems 244.
- Gordan, J. D.: J. A. Gee and P. J. Sturm (trs. and eds.), Letters of Joseph Conrad to Marguerite Paradowska 1890-1920 233
- Greene, R. L.: J. L. Clifford, Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs Thrale) 390.
- Greenfield, K. R.: H. Rudman, Italian Nationalism and English Letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian men of letters 235.
- Ham, E. B.: Séraphin Marion, Les Lettres canadiennes d'autrefois 318.
- Harbage, A.: A. Thaler, Shakespeare and Democracy 376
- Havens, G. R.: J. E. Barker, Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the *Encyclopédie* 398; L. C. Rosenfield, From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine 681.
- Havens, R. D.: R. D. Altick, Richard Owen Cambridge 687.
- Haywood, R. M.: C. W. Mendell, Our Seneca 228
- Heffner, R.: W. Nelson, John Skelton, Laureate 72.
- Hillhouse, J. T.: A. B. Sutherland, Maurice Hewlett 324.
- Hillyer, R. Correspondence of Robert Bridges and Henry Bradley, 1900-1923 232.
- Keating, G. T.: J. D. Gordan, Joseph Conrad, The Making of a Novelist 307.
- Kelley, M.: McColley, G., *Paradise Lost* 295.
- Kirk, C. M.: H. E. Woodbridge, Sir William Temple, The Man and His Work; F. J. Fielden (ed.), Sir William Temple: Three Essays 219.
- Lancaster, H. C.: A. Feuillerat, Baudelaire et la Belle aux cheveux d'or 81; A. Feuillerat (ed.), Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University 154; H. G. Harvey, The Theatre of the Basoche 317
- Lane, F. C.: A. H. Gilbert (ed.), Machiavelli, *The Prince* and Other Works 478.
- Lyons, C. P.: E. Neff, A Revolution in European Poetry 322.
- McKillop, A. D.: R. C. Boys (ed.), *Grongar Hill*, by John Dyer 481.
- Malakis, E.: I. O. Wade, Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet. an Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey 238.
- Malone, K. C. M. Garnier, Eiré, Histoire d'Irlande 79; Axel Olrik (ed.), E. M. Smith-Dampier (tr.), A Book of Danish Ballads 79; Margaret Williams, Word-Hoard 156; S. K. Workman, Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose 79.
- Meylan, E. F.: L. C. Keating, Studies on the Literary Salon in France, 1550-1615 476.
- Millett, F. B.: E. W. Parks, Charles Egbert Craddock 308.
- Mossner, E. C.: Norton, W. J., Jr., Bishop Butler 297.
- Muchnic, H.: R. A. Gettmann, Turgenev in England and America 404.

- Nethercot, A. H.: B. Harris, Charles Sackville 302.
- Nitchie, E.: N. I. White, Shelley 221.
- Nitze, W. A.: A. G. Brodeur, Arthur, Dux Bellorum 64.
- Orians, G. H.: A. Turner, Hawthorne as Editor 402.
- Painter, S.: J. J. Parry (ed.), *The Art of Courtly Love* By Andreas Capellanus 315.
- Parker, W. R.: H. F. Fletcher (ed.), *The Complete Poetical Works of John Milton* 686; F. A. Patterson, an Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton 405.
- Patch, H. R.: W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster (eds.), *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* 383.
- Potter, G. R.: L. J. Henkin, Darwinism in the English Novel, 1860-1910 323.
- Price, L. M.: Irene Wiem, *Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600* 161.
- Sanderlin, G.: E. K. Heningham, An Early Latin Debate of the Body and Soul 217.
- Schutz, A. H.: R. T. Hill and T. G. Bergin, *Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours* 316.
- Scott-Craig, T. S. K.: McColley, G., *Paradise Lost* 295.
- Selmer, C.: J. K. Bostock (ed.), *Der arme Heinrich*, a Poem by Hartmann von Ouwe 406; M. Thorp, *The Study of the Nibelungenlied* 321.
- Shafer, R.: G. N. Shuster, *The English Ode from Milton to Keats* 158; D. Mallam (ed.), *Letters of William Shenstone*; M. Williams (ed.), *The Letters of William Shenstone* 68.
- Sherburn, G.: J. Butt and G. Tillotson (eds.), *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, Vols. IV and II 385.
- Singleton, C. S.: J. G. Fucilla, *Universal Author Repertoire of Italian Essay Literature* 686.
- Smith, M. I.: L. B. Simpson (ed.), *El Arcipreste de Talavera* 313.
- Snyder, A. D.: H. Davis, W. C. De Vane, and R. C. Bald, *Nineteenth-Century Studies* 159.
- Solano, L. F.: R. A. Hall, Jr., *Bibliography of Italian Linguistics* 400.
- Spargo, J. W.: H. M. Belden (ed.), *Ballads and Songs collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society* 479.
- Spencer, H.: G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stages* 321; G. I. Duthie, *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study* 223; J. C. Hodges, *William Congreve the Man* 226.
- Spitzer, L.: Mario Pei, *The Italian Language* 148.
- Stefansky, G.: Glenn Gray, *Hegel's Hellenic Ideal* 310; F. J. Schmitz, *Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus* 74.
- Steinhauer, H., *Fifty Years of German Drama* 242.
- Taylor, A., *Deutscher Volklieder mit ihren Melodien* 77; W. de Vreese and J. de Vries (eds.), *Das Dyalogus of twisprake tusschen den wisen coninck Salomon ende Marcolphus* 162.
- Teeter, L.: D. M. Hoare, *Some Studies in the Modern Novel* 243.
- Thrall, M. M. H.: L. A. Marchand, *The Athenaeum*; R. Buchmann, Martin F. Tupper; M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868* 677.
- Van Horne, J.: P. P. Rogers, *Goldoni in Spain* 683.
- Walz, J. A.: Hohlfeld, Joos, Twaddell, Wortindex zu Goethes *Faust* 288.
- White, William: C. K. Hyder, A. Concordance to the Poems of A. E. Housman; T. G. Ehrsam, *A Bibliography of A. E. Housman* 293.
- Whitney, Lois: H. R. Brown, *The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789-1860* 305.
- Williams, S. T.: P. J. Brockway, Sylvester Judd (1813-1853), *Novelist of Transcendentalism* 309.
- Winslow, O. E.: T. H. Johnson, *The Printed Writings of Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, a Bibliography* 230.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P.: R. M. Davis, *The Good Lord Lyttelton* 298.
- Zucker, A. E.: A. Schirokauer and W. Paulsen (eds.), *Corona* 239.